

# The Reformed Church Review

Volume 5

JANUARY, 1926

Number 1

## PROGRAM

**Wednesday, September Thirtieth**

SIX P.M.

*Santee Prayer Hall*

SERVICE OF CONSECRATION

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D., presiding

INVOCATION

CANTICLE

PRAYER

SCRIPTURE LESSON: *John xv*

CHANT: *Psalm Eighty-four*

CONFESSION OF FAITH

ACT OF CONSECRATION

PRAYER, THE REVEREND JOHN C. BOWMAN, D.D.

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

SERMON, THE REVEREND CHRISTOPHER NOSS, D.D.

PRAYER, closing with the LORD'S PRAYER

HYMN—

Hymnal 377

DOXOLOGY

BENEDICTION

**Wednesday, September Thirtieth**

SEVEN P.M.

*The Refectory*

LUNCHEON FOR MINISTERS AND ALUMNI

THE REVEREND LEE M. ERDMAN,

President of the Alumni Association, presiding

PRAYER, THE REVEREND A. S. WEBER, D.D.

## ADDRESSES: "The Forward Look"

THE REVEREND A. M. GLUCK, D.D.  
 THE REVEREND W. S. CRAMER, D.D.  
 THE REVEREND F. C. SEITZ, D.D.  
 HEADMASTER W. M. IRVINE, PH.D.

RESPONSE, THE PRESIDENT

SEVEN P.M.

*The Home of President and Mrs. Richards*  
 RECEPTION AND LUNCHEON FOR WOMEN

**Thursday, October First**

NINE-THIRTY A.M.

Academic Procession from Main Hall of the College

TEN A.M.

*Santee Prayer Hall*

DEAN IRWIN HOCH DELONG, PH.D., presiding

INVOCATION

HYMN—

Hymnal 532

THE APOSTLES' CREED

PRAYER, THE REVEREND ALBERT E. TRUXAL, D.D.

GREETINGS AND ADDRESSES

The General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United  
 States

THE REVEREND JACOB C. LEONARD, D.D., President

The District Synods

THE REVEREND J. RAUCH STEIN, D.D.  
 Stated Clerk of the Eastern Synod

The Boards

THE REVEREND ALLEN R. BARTHOLOMEW, D.D.  
 Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions

Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio

THE REVEREND GEORGE STIBITZ, PH.D., D.D., Professor

Mission House, Plymouth, Wisconsin

THE REVEREND JOHN M. G. DARMS, D.D., President

Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

THE REVEREND HENRY H. APPLE, D.D., LL.D., President

Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio

THE REVEREND HENRY L. BEAM, A.M., Professor

Catawba College, Salisbury, North Carolina

THE REVEREND ELMER R. HOKE, PH.D., President

Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania

PROFESSOR GEORGE L. OMWAKE, PH.D., LL.D., President

HYMN—

Hymnal 490

ADDRESS

“A Century of Theological Education and After”

THE REVEREND WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., Professor

Union Theological Seminary, New York

DOXOLOGY

BENEDICTION

TWELVE TO THREE P.M.

CLASS REUNIONS

THREE P.M.

*Santee Prayer Hall*

THE REVEREND CHARLES B. SCHNEDER, D.D.

President of the Board of Visitors, presiding

HYMN—

Hymnal 2

PRAYER, THE REVEREND JOHN F. DELONG, D.D.

GREETINGS AND ADDRESSES

North Japan College, Sendai, Japan

THE REVEREND JAIRUS P. MOORE, D.D.

Huping Christian College, Hunan, China

PROFESSOR GEORGE W. BACHMAN, A.M.

Cedar Crest College

THE REVEREND WILLIAM F. CURTIS, LITT.D., President

Hood College

PROFESSOR JOSEPH H. APPLE, LL.D., President

Miyagi College, Sendai, Japan

THE REVEREND ALLEN K. FAUST, PH.D., President

The Academies

PROFESSOR WILLIAM MANN IRVINE, PH.D., LL.D.,  
Headmaster

HYMN—

Hymnal 417

ADDRESS

THE REVEREND S. PARKES CADMAN, D.D., LL.D.

President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ  
in America

DOXOLOGY

BENEDICTION

SEVEN P.M.

*Stevens House*

THE CENTENNIAL DINNER

JOHN W. APPEL, LL.D., President of the Board of  
Trustees, presiding

INVOCATION, THE REVEREND WALTER E. KREBS, D.D.

SPEAKERS AFTER DINNER

THOMAS M. BALLIET, PH.D.

Formerly Dean of the Department of Pedagogy, University  
of New York

THE REVEREND CORNELIUS WOELFKIN, D.D., LL.D.

Pastor of the Park Avenue Baptist Church, New York City

HYMN: "America"

BENEDICTION



*Program*

5

**Friday, October Second**

NINE-THIRTY A.M.

Academic Procession from the College

TEN A.M.

*Santee Prayer Hall*

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D., presiding

INVOCATION

HYMN—

Hymnal 58

PRAYER, THE REVEREND ELLIS N. KREMER, D.D.

RECEPTION OF DELEGATES

PRESENTATION BY PROFESSOR THEODORE F. HERMAN, D.D.

Secretary of the Faculty

ADDRESSES

PROFESSOR JOHN H. RAVEN, D.D.

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America,  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

PRESIDENT J. ROSS STEVENSON, D.D., LL.D.

Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church,  
Princeton, New Jersey

PRESIDENT HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mount Airy  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

HYMN—

Hymnal 607

ADDRESS: "Mysticism and Religious Education"

PROFESSOR RUFUS M. JONES, D.D., LL.D.

Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania

DOXOLOGY

BENEDICTION

TWO-THIRTY P.M.

*Santee Prayer Hall*

THE REVEREND EDWARD S. BROMER, D.D., Professor,  
presiding

HYMN—

Hymnal 91

PRAYER, THE REVEREND CHARLES A. SANTEE, D.D.  
Fort Washington, Pennsylvania

ADDRESS: "The Spirit of the Seminary—An Interpretation"

THE REVEREND GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D.,  
President

ADDRESS: "Christian Education at the Present Time"

PROVOST J. H. PENNIMAN, PH.D., LL.D.  
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

HYMN—

Hymnal 104

## BENEDICTION

FOUR P.M.

*The home of President and Mrs. Richards*

RECEPTION TO DELEGATES AND GUESTS

## THE ACADEMIC PROCESSION

Marshal

The President and the Former President of the Seminary

Speakers of the Day

The Faculty of the Seminary

The Board of Trustees of the Seminary

The Board of Visitors of the Seminary

The Faculty of Franklin and Marshall College

Ecclesiastical Delegates

(According to order in list of Delegates)

Academic Delegates

(According to order in list of Delegates)

Alumni

(In order of Graduation)

Ministers

DELEGATES

ECCLESIASTICAL DELEGATES

*The General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States*

THE REVEREND JACOB C. LEONARD, D.D., President

*The Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States*

THE REVEREND J. RAUCH STEIN, D.D., Stated Clerk

*The Pittsburgh Synod*

THE REVEREND CHARLES L. NOSS, President

*The Potomac Synod*

THE REVEREND J. STEWART HARTMAN, President

*The Ohio Synod*

THE REVEREND FREDERICK W. LEICH, D.D.,  
Stated Clerk

*The German Synod of the East*

THE REVEREND CARL H. GRAMM, D.D., President

*The Church of Christ in Japan*

THE REVEREND YASUJI JO

*The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America*

THE REVEREND S. PARKES CADMAN, D.D., LL.D.,  
President

*The Board of Ministerial Relief*

THE REVEREND WALLACE H. WOTRING, PH.D.,  
LL.D., President

*The Board of Home Missions*

THE REVEREND CHARLES E. SCHAEFFER, D.D.,  
Secretary

*The Board of Foreign Missions*

THE REVEREND ALLEN R. BARTHOLOMEW, D.D.,  
Secretary

*The Publication and Sunday School Board*

THE REVEREND CONRAD CLEVER, D.D., President

*The Board of Christian Education*

THE REVEREND HENRY I. STAHR, Member

*The Woman's Missionary Society of General Synod*

MRS. LEWIS L. ANEWALT, Treasurer

## ACADEMIC DELEGATES

## THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

- 1636 *The Theological School in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.*  
FREDERICK ROBINSON GRIFFIN, D.D., Alumnus
- 1784 *New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.*  
JOHN H. RAVEN, D.D., Professor
- 1812 *Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.*  
JOSEPH ROSS STEVENSON, D.D., LL.D., President
- 1816 *Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.*  
DAVID DUNN, A.M., Alumnus
- 1818 *Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.*  
WILLIAM JOHN HINKE, PH.D., D.D., Professor
- 1825 *The Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.*  
DAVID FRAZIER MCGILL, D.D., LL.D., Professor
- 1826 *Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.*  
HERBERT CHRISTIAN ALLEMAN, D.D., Professor
- 1834 *Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.*  
ELMER ELLSWORTH JOHNSON, PH.D., Professor
- 1836 *Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.*  
WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D., Professor
- 1846 *Meadville Theological School, Meadville, Pa.*  
MILTON THOMAS GARVIN, Trustee
- 1850 *Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, O.*  
GEORGE STIBITZ, D.D., Professor
- 1850 *Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.*  
ARTHUR CHARLES BALDWIN, D.D., Alumnus
- 1858 *Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.*  
FRANKLIN PIERCE MANHART, D.D., LL.D., Dean

- 1862 *The Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, Pa.*  
ROYDEN KEITH YERKES, PH.D., S.T.D., Professor
- 1862 *Mission House College, Plymouth, Wis.*  
JOHN M. G. DARMS, D.D., President
- 1864 *Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.*  
HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, D.D., LL.D., President
- 1868 *The Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.*  
MILTON G. EVANS, D.D., LL.D., President
- 1869 *Boston University, School of Theology, Boston, Mass.*  
SHERIDAN WATSON BELL, D.D., Alumnus
- 1883 *The Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.*  
DAVID SCHLEY SCHAFF, D.D., Professor
- 1884 *The Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md.*  
HUGH LATIMER ELDERDICE, D.D., LL.D., President

COLLEGES

- 1740 *University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.*  
JAMES P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD, PH.D., LITT.D., Professor
- 1787 *Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.*  
HENRY HARBAUGH APPLE, D.D., LL.D., President
- 1850 *Heidelberg University, Tiffin, O.*  
HENRY L. BEAM, A.M., Professor
- 1852 *Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.*  
ELMER RHODES HOKE, PH.D., President
- 1866 *Cedar Crest, Allentown, Pa.*  
WILLIAM F. CURTIS, LITT.D., President
- 1867 *Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.*  
THE REVEREND P. GEORGE SIEGER, D.D., Alumnus

- 1869 *Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.*  
GEORGE LESLIE OMWAKE, Pd.D., LL.D., President
- 1886 *North Japan College, Sendai, Japan*  
JAIRUS P. MOORE, D.D., Missionary
- 1886 *Miyagi College, Sendai, Japan*  
ALLEN K. FAUST, Ph.D., President
- 1893 *Hood College, Frederick, Md.*  
JOSEPH HENRY APPLE, LL.D., President
- 1902 *Albright College, Myerstown, Pa.*  
CLELLAN ASBURY BOWMAN, Ph.D., President
- 1903 *Huping Christian College, Yochow, Hunan, China*  
GEORGE W. BACHMAN, A.M., Professor

## ACADEMIES

- 1746 *Linden Hall Seminary, Lititz, Pa.*  
FREDERICK WILLIAM STENGEL, D.D., Principal
- 1787 *Franklin and Marshall Academy, Lancaster, Pa.*  
EDWIN MITMAN HARTMAN, Pd.D., Principal
- 1856 *Millersville State Normal School, Millersville, Pa.*  
MARK E. STINE, Professor
- 1865 *Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa.*  
WILLIAM MANN IRVINE, Ph.D., LL.D., Headmaster
- 1899 *Massanutten Academy, Woodstock, Va.*  
HOWARD JOHNSON BENCHOFF, Pd.D., Headmaster
- 1903 *Ziemer Memorial Girls' School, Yochow, Hunan, China*  
GERTRUDE B. HOY, A.B., Principal
- 1907 *Eastview Boys' School, Shenchow, China*  
GEORGE RANDOLPH SNYDER, B.D., Missionary
- 1907 *Shenchow Girls' School, Shenchow, China*  
MRS. GEORGE RANDOLPH SNYDER, A.B., Missionary

# I

## RIGHT WORSHIP—GEN. 28: 16, 17

THE REVEREND CHRISTOPHER NOSS, D.D.

*Sendai, Japan*

We have come together to reconsecrate a principal shrine of the Reformed Church in the United States. Moved about from place to place, it has hitherto been more like a tabernacle than a temple. But now, in the confidence that it has found a permanent abode, we have erected here an altar of solid stone, to commemorate the presence of God in our midst. At such a time our minds are irresistibly drawn to the simplicities of Genesis.

"And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other than the House of God, and this is the Gate of Heaven."

Our critical scholars may discuss the genesis of Genesis, and set forth pros and cons with regard to the historicity of a narrative like that of the life of Jacob; but we prefer to view the story as a whole, and we find it quite convincing. Our nervous psychological educators may protest that the story of Jacob is full of dangerous suggestion, and really ought not to be read to little children; but for our part we give even children credit for the power to discriminate, and to perceive the vital message of that story. It is not the purpose of Genesis to teach us history, nor even morals: it has to do with a vastly more important theme, namely, the way of God with mankind.

So as we listen once more to the story of Jacob at Bethel, which has always had power to thrill the Christian Church—

the story that inspired our great hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee"—I would that we, too, might tarry awhile with Jacob at the foot of the rocky stairway of Luz, that we might with him dream of the angels of God ascending and descending between heaven and earth, and that we might for ourselves renew his conviction that God is right here, and that to bless.

First, let us consider the prevenient grace of God in this case. Of Jacob before he comes to this great experience, about all that we know is evil. One is appalled at the ruthlessness with which he disposes of his rival, and one wonders how God could have preferred this loveless liar to his genial brother Esau, as it is written, *Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated*. But beneath Jacob's unscrupulousness was a deep concern for the future, and beneath this was, no doubt, something akin to the pioneering faith of his grandfather Abraham. The very manner of his instant response to the divine approach at Bethel justifies God's election of him, and indicates the power that was finally to deliver him and his from the barbaric morals of the age.

Likewise, we of the Reformed Church in the United States have been blessed as the very elect of God. No good thing has been withholden us, and our lot is the envy of the world. We have a land flowing with milk and honey. We have hardly begun to develop the capabilities of the wholesome countryfolk that so largely make up our constituency. There is hardly a limit to what we might accomplish for the world if we had the will. We need to consider how little we deserve what we have, and to recall the warning given to Jacob's descendants, "lest thou say in thy heart, My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth, but thou shalt remember the Lord thy God, for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth."

"Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye were digged." Who and what manner of men were our ancestors, who were led into this



avored land? Among them there were certainly a few enthusiasts who braved the perils of the wilderness for religious reasons; but were not most of them wretched impoverished peasants, redemptioners, mercenaries, even fugitives and the like?

But some one will say, After all, they belonged to a superior race. No: that is not true. "God made of one every nation of men." There is in Christ no distinction between Jew and Greek and Scythian, between white and yellow and black. Let us not be misled by the antichrist of the twentieth century that would grade the one human family, and persuade us that one race is *inherently superior to another*. It is true that tyranny and poverty may for a time eliminate all but the coarsest strain in any race; true also that certain vices bring on diseases that affect the very substance of heredity for generations; but in the long run every race is equally capable of showing forth the glory of God.

By nature we are no better than Jacob was. Both as a race and as individuals we should say with the Apostle Paul, By the grace of God I am what I am.

Secondly, we should observe that God's choice of a race or of an individual is not a matter of arbitrary caprice, but is a step toward the fulfilment of an all-embracing purpose.

To the chivalrous chieftain Abraham came the divine assurance, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." No less to the gentle pacifist Isaac was the same promise given, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Now Jacob at Bethel receives the thrice-repeated benediction, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." It was the consciousness of a special mission for the benefit of the whole world that became the chief factor in developing the marvelous morale of the descendants of Jacob, the people of Israel.

It was likewise the awakening consciousness of a special mission that delivered our Reformed Church in the United

States from impending dissolution a hundred years ago. At the close of the first hundred years of our history in America (1725-1825) the impact of the spiritual influences brought to bear upon our people by the fathers of the eighteenth century had become little more than a memory. The dry rot of conservatism had set in. Our energetic young Otterbeins and Winebrenners had been estranged and had gone off to build up offshoots more vigorous than the parent stem.

Then like a refreshing breeze from the southwest came a clarion call to missionary endeavor. The remarkable address published in 1820 by Lewis Mayer and his associates declared: "Two different institutions are necessary, namely, a theological seminary for the education of young men for the ministry, and a missionary establishment for the preaching of the gospel in those places in which there are no settled pastors. . . . The state of our Church demands a great and general effort in all its members. If we cannot resolve upon such an effort, any one who will open his eyes may easily perceive that the German Reformed Church in this country cannot be of very long continuance." It is not extravagant to say that to the vision and persistence of Lewis Mayer, the first professor of this Seminary, our Reformed Church in the second century of its history in America owes more than to any other human factor. He was truly the founder of the Reformed Church as we know it in our generation. And we should never forget that it was the vision of a divinely-appointed task set before the Church that inspired him to the heroic endeavor and sacrifice without which this one-hundredth anniversary could not have been.

In the third place I would ask, Is it possible to sum up in a phrase the distinctive genius of this Reformed Church? For what do we stand? It seems to me that in "right worship," with all that the expression properly implies, we find the secret of our life, as a distinct body, our *raison d'être*.

By "right worship" is meant that type of spiritual devotion which stands in its proper relation to the moral life.

In our busy western world worship is likely to become one of the lost arts. When the man from Main Street goes to church he has little patience with what he calls the "preliminary exercises" before the sermon, and he wants the sermon to be "practical." He needs to learn that his extreme practicality is after all most impractical. For what we most require is not so much discussion of what ought to be done and of what ought not to be done as it is the establishment of such a relation with God as will awaken in us the will to do the right.

It is to be observed that as we follow the history of Christianity back toward its source, as we go back to the Eastern Church, as in Russia or Greece, we enter the realm of mysticism, where little attention is paid to practical problems, where adoration is all in all, and even the sermon, if indeed it exists, is but a form of the contemplation of the mysteries.

Midway between the ancient world and the modern, between the East and the West, we find the Roman Church striving to combine the practical with the devotional, by establishing the discipline of the confessional by the side of the worship at the altar. But it seems to us of the Reformed Church that the combination thus effected is forced and artificial, and we shall never be satisfied until altar and pulpit are harmonized inwardly and vitally. In this ideal of right worship we believe that we have the way of escape from both the obscure superstition that clusters about the usual eastern altar and the futile exhortation that characterizes many a western pulpit.

It was not accidental that the controversies that beset the early history of the Reformed Church in Europe four hundred years ago had to do mainly with the Lord's Supper. This sacrament, though it may appear to the man of the world a small matter, is the "inmost sanctuary of the whole

Christian worship." Our interpretation of, and attitude toward, this sacrament, determine the character of all our worship, and worship is the fundamental factor in the whole Christian life.

Nor was it accidental that the development of the Reformed Church in the United States in the second century, the century now ended, was marked by a violent liturgical controversy. In that conflict both sides made mistakes, but both were right in laying emphasis as they did on worship as a matter of supreme importance.

On the occasion of this solemn rededication we may heartily rejoice that as the pupil is a memorial to our great preacher Benjamin Bausman, so at the base of the altar is inscribed the name of Gerhart. We whose privilege it was to sit at Gerhart's feet fully appreciate the appropriateness of this memorial; for all his teaching was an elaboration of what he called "objectivity." That is, in right worship the significant thing is not so much what we do as what God does. We love Him because he first loved us.

Finally let us consider for a moment what the essence of worship is. It is the spontaneous reaction of the soul to the presence of God.

"And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other than the House of God, and this is the Gate of Heaven." There is in this reaction no scheme, no calculation,—simply the unaffected response of the heart in reverence and gratitude.

To illustrate the point, permit me to repeat a personal incident which I have used a hundred times in addressing Japanese hearers. Years ago, when I was distractedly busy in my study, my little boy, three years old, knocked on the door. Unwilling to be interrupted, I tried to ignore his knocking, but he was so persistent that I was forced at last to open the door. Speaking rather roughly, for I was vexed, I said, What do you want? The little man replied, I don't want anything; I just want to be with father. Had

he said that he was hurt or hungry or weary or afraid, would not any father's heart be quick to proffer the needed help? But all that he wanted was the father's presence. Happy the family in which to the end of life it remains true that parent and child find delight in just being together.

So also right worship is just delight in the presence of God understood in His true character, that is, through Christ and by the Spirit of Christ. In the course of time this, and this alone, proves to be the cure for all our ills.

In the life of Jacob, after that first visit to Bethel, there was much sin, and much shame. He could not suddenly divest himself of his selfish cunning, nor could Rachel quickly discard her ancestral teraphim. But note how the heart of Jacob afterwards was drawn again to that same Bethel. "Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the foreign gods that are among you, and purify yourselves and change your garments; and let us arise, and go up to Bethel." The vision at Bethel was the beginning of the purification of Israel.

This beautiful sanctuary is now reconsecrated to the service of those who seek the presence of God. Sophisticated as we are by the artificialities of our modern life, we have need here of the aid of art and of music. But let simplicity be the keynote. Let everything be done to help and nothing to hinder the communion of struggling souls with God. Let us pray that our theological students, who pass here several of the most trying years of their lives, may not fail to get the quickening vision, the victory over all tormenting doubt.

Then in the centuries to come pilgrims will come from afar to worship at this shrine and to thank God for untold blessings brought into their lives through some of those who once knelt here, who here gained the power to overcome a host of ills and to render to humanity services of incalculable value, who here like Jacob at Bethel caught a vision of the Eternal, and here like Jacob at Peniel wrestled until the breaking of the day.

## II

### A CENTURY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND AFTER

PROFESSOR WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.

*Union Theological Seminary, New York*

It is one of the most important functions of an anniversary that it furnishes a convenient occasion for taking stock. When the new year comes, or a birthday, we are reminded of the significance of these days and weeks that slip by so remorselessly. We stop a moment and ask ourselves of the life we are living, What does it mean? Whither is it tending? And when the anniversary is not simply one of an individual but of an institution, the challenge becomes correspondingly greater. The weeks group themselves into years; the years into decades and centuries. We realize that the life we have been living, the work we have been doing, is the stuff of which history is made. We try to estimate what institutions mean for the life of man, what part in the complex situation we call society it has been given to our own institution to play.

These thoughts have been vividly present in my mind during the last few days. I have just returned from Europe where the speed at which life is lived is less and men have more leisure and more aptitude for reflection. To the European, of whatever nation, history is the biggest of all facts. Wherever he looks he is conscious of antiquity: in buildings, in institutions, in sentiments, in habits of mind. What has been acquires a certain sanctity from the mere fact of its survival, and change when it comes is realized for the creative and revolutionary thing it is.

But here at home we are too busy to question what we

are doing; often to notice where we are going. In this land of unlimited possibilities, speed seems the standard of success. It is a good thing simply to be alive, since life means growth, progress—the bursting of the sap through the twig, the coursing of the blood through the veins. No building so old but down it must come to make place for a bigger and better; no institution so venerable but it must surrender its right to be if a better can be devised to take its place. The history in which we Americans are interested is the history which we are making ourselves.

I welcome the opportunity, therefore, that your invitation gives me to exchange this mood of breathlessness, however exhilarating, for one of a more reflective character. We are met to celebrate the One Hundredth Anniversary of an institution. No great age as European standards go, but for our American measurement a respectable antiquity. The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster is one of the oldest of our American seminaries. Only a dozen institutions of its kind precede it: The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick (1774); the United Presbyterian Seminary at Xenia (1784); Andover (1808); the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary at Pittsburgh (1810); Princeton (1812); Bangor (1814); Hartwick (1816); Colgate (1819); Auburn (1820); the General Theological Seminary (1822); the Episcopal Seminary at Alexandria (1823); Newton (1825). Only two of these ante-date Lancaster by more than seventeen years. It came into being at a time when important changes were taking place in the religious and educational life of America. Its history covers the most significant part of the story of the training of the American ministry. It will therefore serve as a convenient text for our theme: *A Century of Theological Education and After*.

I have said that the Seminary at Lancaster was one of the first theological seminaries in the United States. That does not mean, of course, that theological education in the tech-



nical sense of that term began only a century ago. Its history goes back much further, almost to the beginning of the American colonies. One of the chief objects which led to the establishment of the first colleges was to make provision for the education of a competent ministry. During the first century and a half of their existence the colleges of the United States were for the most part schools of theology. Only gradually and as a result of causes presently to be explained was the theological seminary as such differentiated from the other departments of the college and made into a graduate school like the schools of medicine and law. This differentiation in part preceded, in part paralleled, the founding of independent theological seminaries and was due in part to the same causes which produced them. One of these causes was the growing complexity of life, with its corresponding differentiation of occupation. The simpler conditions of the pioneer era where the individual was a jack of all trades, able to turn his hand to anything which might require attention, were succeeded by the more highly organized society of the later colonial period. The minister was no longer the only well educated man in the community. He shared that distinction with the lawyer and the doctor. Commerce and industry were making increasing demands upon the younger generation, and that familiar type, the American man of business, began to appear. The general education that was sufficient for all was no longer adequate, and the professional school in the modern sense of that word was born.

These changes affected theological education. The man who wished to enter the ministry during the first century and a half of our history had one of two possibilities open to him. Either he might associate himself as a kind of apprentice with some distinguished divine who in addition to his ordinary clerical duties was willing to give theological instruction to one or two promising students; or he might attend some college like Harvard or Yale where the ordinary



classical curriculum which furnished the common training of all educated men was supplemented by a stiff dose of exegesis and dogmatic theology. One of the chief duties of the college president was to lecture on systematic theology, and some of the most important of the older treatises were preached to college students before they were given to the press. We are sometimes tempted to forget, in view of more recent developments, that it was not to Princeton Theological Seminary, but to Princeton College, that Jonathan Edwards was called as President.

But it was not simply the increasing differentiation of occupation which produced the modern seminary. That might have been met, as it was, by the creation of professional schools of theology at colleges like Harvard (1819) and Yale (1822). The growing denominational consciousness required this outlet. During the pre-Revolutionary period the dependence of the American churches upon the mother country was very close. They looked to Great Britain and to the Continent to fill the depleted ranks of their ministry, and their standards of judgment, educational and religious, were largely those of the old world. But with the new spirit of independence in matters political went a corresponding independence in matters ecclesiastical. The Presbyterianism which expressed itself in the declaration of principles of the first General Assembly in 1788 was a different thing from the Presbyterianism of Scotland or Wales, and similar contrasts appeared in connection with the other communions. I have heard an Episcopal bishop of Virginia say of the Lambeth proposals that they were a late return by the Church of England to the principles which had governed the Diocese of Virginia from its foundation. So American Methodists and American Lutherans speedily developed ideals of their own, and these ideals were reflected in the character of their ecclesiastical organization.

Out of this new self-consciousness the American seminary was born. It represented the attempt of the free church in

the free state to direct the education of its ministry along lines which were believed to be necessary for the welfare of the church. One denomination after another created its own institutions—first the Dutch Reformed, then the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Baptists and Episcopalians in rapid succession. It was this impulse which led to the foundation of the Seminary whose centennial we celebrate to-day. It was the child of the church, created to furnish a ministry for the church.

One further influence needs brief mention—the desire on the part of the stricter party in the church to protect the prospective candidate for the ministry from the insidious enticements of heresy. Andover was founded by a group of conservative Congregationalists in protest against the Unitarian tendencies which had begun to dominate the theological instruction at Harvard. The cleavage between liberal and conservative, orthodox and heretic, which found drastic expression in the new foundation recurs in less dramatic form in connection with other institutions and must be taken into account in any attempt to estimate the history that we are passing in review.

We have then, at the period at which our history opens, three types of theological school: the seminaries that were ecclesiastically founded and controlled; the theological departments of colleges; private institutions like Andover, governed by self-perpetuating boards of trustees and founded to promote a definite type of Christian belief and experience, conservative or liberal as the case might be.

Yet, in spite of these differences, the similarities were surprisingly great. Take any of the dozen seminaries which I have mentioned in the middle of the second quarter of the last century and you would have found a substantial identity both of subject and of method. The subjects studied were the same: the languages, Hebrew and Greek; Exegesis, Systematic Theology, and a smattering of Homiletics. The method was in substance the same. The Bible was regarded

as an inerrant book, the vehicle of a divine revelation which Systematic Theology formulated on the basis of results reached by Exegesis. Men might differ as to what the Bible taught. They were at one in the conviction that what it taught was true and that it was man's duty to receive its teaching at its face value. Channing's famous sermon on Unitarianism was preached only six years before the foundation of Lancaster Theological Seminary, but his views on the Bible were not materially different from those of the Andover divines who had left Harvard in protest eleven years before.

This common attitude toward the problems of theological instruction reflected a corresponding unity in the conception of religion itself. In spite of superficial differences, denominational and theological, the conception of religion which prevailed in the American churches during the first half of the last century was substantially identical. Religion was compounded of doctrines and precepts, doctrines to be believed, duties to be practiced. Both alike rested upon a divinely given revelation contained in the Bible and authenticated by miracle and prophecy. The high and dry rationalism of the Deistic period was, to be sure, modified and sweetened by the fervour of Whitfield and the Wesleys, but they left the theoretical foundation of the old theology unchanged and it was this foundation which determined the teaching of the early American Seminary.

How different the conditions which confront us at the close of the century which has intervened! The dozen or more seminaries of the first quarter of the eighteenth century have become more than a hundred and thirty; the ten millions of people whom they served have multiplied more than eleven fold.<sup>1</sup> The simple curriculum that sufficed for our great-grandfathers has been stuffed to bursting with new subjects, and the Bible and Systematic Theology, then, one might almost say, the sole subjects of study, must com-

<sup>1</sup> In 1820—9,638,453; in 1925—113,493,720.

pete for their place with Church History, the Philosophy of Religion, Psychology and Sociology, Comparative Religion and Missions, Religious Education and Practical Theology in a constantly increasing number of special applications. Barren indeed is the day which does not bring to the president of a theological seminary the suggestion of some new course with which to enrich the curriculum, from church architecture and music to advertising and finance. One hardly knows whether to congratulate the prospective student or to condole with him, when one realizes the bewildering variety of subjects with which he is called to cope and the rival possibilities between which he is asked to choose. And this outward variety of subjects is but the reflex of an inner change which has substituted for the simple trust of our fathers an attitude of questioning which reaches down to the very foundations of the Christian faith. It is not with application that we find our greatest difficulties, but with principles; not with method, but with goal.

How has this change come about and what does it portend for the future? In the few moments at my disposal I can touch only, and most briefly, upon the most important points.

As with the earlier change already referred to we must seek our first clue in the changed environment. The century that has passed has witnessed revolutionary changes in the social conditions under which the individual must live his life. For one thing, it has been the century of the industrial revolution—that momentous change which, putting undreamed of powers into the hands of man, has altered his habits in ways as unforeseen as they were revolutionary. One hundred years ago great cities were unknown; factories on the modern scale were non-existent. Men passed easily from the farm to the town and back again, and the education that fitted for one fitted for the other. To-day one-sixth of our population lives in cities of at least one hundred thousand. A single corporation employs fifty thousand

men and the group of industries which together compose the United States Steel Corporation fixes the wages and hours of labor for more than a quarter of a million men.<sup>2</sup> Under these conditions the liberty of the individual which was the common assumption both of the older ethics and of the older theology is restricted in countless ways and his attitude to the church is modified accordingly.

Closely allied with the foregoing and scarcely less important is the change in the character of the immigrants from which the population of the United States has been recruited. During the first two centuries of our history the voyagers who came to this country in search of a new home, however widely they might differ in nationality, were in the main of the same stock. They came from Great Britain and the northern countries of Europe: Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Norway. The Latin countries contributed their share, but they were less important both in numbers and in influence. But during the last century the proportion has shifted. Southern Europe has begun to pour in its immigrants, and with the Latins have come the Slavs. Whole colonies have grown up in our great cities, ignorant of our language and of our traditions, knowing only of our country what the parents learn from the janitor of the tenement or the foreman in the factory, and the children have taught them in the public schools. They live in quarters which, while comparing favorably with the conditions they left in the old country, represent a standard of living appreciably lower than that of the population they replace. And while they have performed an invaluable service in building our railroads and manning our factories they present us with problems of citizenship of which our fathers had not dreamed.

One effect of this change is registered in the irreligious character of our public school system. In a homogeneous community, predominantly Christian and Protestant in char-

<sup>2</sup> 277,000.

acter, the public schools may reflect the religious ideals of the parents without violation of the constitutional provision for religious freedom. The Bible may be read, prayer conducted, and the consciousness of God made a factor in the life of pupils and teachers alike. But where differences exist so acute as those which now divide our population, this natural solution is no longer possible. The Bible and prayer are banished from the schools and free religion is in danger of becoming for multitudes of our citizens, no religion. A new burden is laid upon the churches which they had not anticipated and for which they had not prepared, and in spite of every effort to meet the new demand through parochial schools, Sunday schools and week-day schools of religion, a large and apparently increasing proportion of our population is growing up without formal religious instruction of any kind.

These outward changes have been accompanied by inward changes even more revolutionary. The industrial revolution without has been paralleled by the intellectual revolution within. The science which has built our railroads and erected our factories has rebuilt our conceptions and refashioned our ideals.

Four great waves have swept over the intellectual life of America and each has left its mark on the institutions through which that life expresses itself. The first is the wave of physical science. When Lancaster was founded Darwin was still a school boy, unknown to fame, and many years were to pass before Huxley would begin his campaign in favor of popular education in science. To-day physics and chemistry are displacing the classics in our universities, and in spite of Mr. Bryan and his Fundamentalists friends the theory of evolution and the ideas from which it sprang dominate the intellectual life of our time.

The second great wave was historical criticism. This, too, began modestly with the reconstruction of ancient documents,—Wolff's *Theory of the Composite Authorship of*

*Homer; Astruc's, Of the Composite Authorship of the Pentateuch.* To the criticism of the Old Testament succeeded criticism of the New. To the criticism of the Bible, that of the creeds and doctrines of the church. The process met with strenuous opposition and more than one critic paid the price in trial, condemnation and expulsion; but the ideas for which they stood continued to make way, and to-day for the greater number of teachers in our seminaries the critical method in history is accepted as a matter of course.

The third wave was that of the new sociology, with its economic interpretation of history and its emphasis on the dependence of the individual upon his social environment. As the physical changes caused by the industrial revolution had uprooted the individual from his home on the farm or in the village and thrown him into the maelstrom of a Pittsburgh or a Chicago, so this new approach to the interpretation of life taught us to see in these radical changes only the most dramatic illustration of a process of interdependence between the individual and his environment which had been going on without intermission since history began. This new viewpoint also began profoundly to affect theology. As there is no such thing as an isolated individual, so, men began to see, there can be no such thing as an isolated salvation. In sin and in salvation alike we are members one of another. No one lives to himself and no one dies to himself.

Latest in the series, and in some respects the most revolutionary of all, was the wave of the new psychology. Physical science had rewritten the history of the physical universe, historical criticism that of religious belief, social science that of religious institutions; but psychology pressed one step further back and attempted to write the natural history of the inner life itself. Into this citadel of religion, where the soul stands face to face with God, came the scientist with his dissecting knife to explain not only the beliefs of religion but its emotions and aspirations. It is not



strange that many who had followed him up to this point were tempted to hold back here. Whatever may be true of belief and of practice, when we come to worship, criticism seems an impertinence.

Underlying all these changes and explaining them has come a new attitude toward the world and toward life. The old philosophy with its clear-cut dualism between nature and the supernatural has been hopelessly discredited for multitudes of people. If they are to find God at all, it must be here and now. The mystery which is still the life breath of religion must be found not outside the world but in the very structure of its mechanism—a part of the air we breath, of the thought we think, of the life we live.

Such, in briefest compass, are some of the changes which the century has witnessed. What have the seminaries done to meet them? Here, it must be confessed, the record is not encouraging. Changes there have been, no doubt; changes of adjustment, changes of addition. But as a whole, taking them in the mass, the machinery with which the seminaries of to-day are equipped is better adapted to the conditions of the age which gave them birth than to the new day which they are facing. Too often it has been a case of new wine and old wine skins; new patches on an old garment. Taking the task as a whole and the equipment as a whole, we can not but be impressed with the lack of adaptation of the means that are being used to the end to which they are directed.

The task, to be sure, is formidable enough. With the wisest of planning and the most economical use of resources, it would be difficult to do what needs to be done. In a territory so vast, where so many people must be reached who are all but untouched by religious education in any form; in dealing with questions so delicate, where there is room for honest differences of opinion between men of good will as to what needs to be done and how to do it, the only hope of success is in a comprehensive plan covering the whole field.



Such a plan is not only as yet non-existent, but there has not even been an attempt to devise it, and this lack of any comprehensive strategy correlating the tactics which individual institutions are employing in their own little sector of the field of battle is the greatest single obstacle to the progress of religious education in the world to-day.

To all who are interested in the problems of theological education, I commend the illuminating survey of conditions in the United States which was made by the American Section of the Commission on Education in preparation for the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm.<sup>1</sup> Here, within the brief compass of less than forty pages, we have a bird's-eye view of the situation which faces the modern church in its effort to win the mind of the modern world for Christ. Whether we look at the school, the college or the university, we find a progressive secularization of education which is all the more dangerous because of the increasing preoccupation of educational theory with practical interests. In a society where the school aspires to be a miniature world with real experiences, real opportunities, real interests and real social relations, the most profound experience, the most inspirational opportunity, the most absorbing interest, the one enduring foundation of true social relations, is for all practical purposes left out. We may well make our own the words with which the Commission recorded their impression of the condition they describe: "This situation would seem impossible if it were not true."

And what is true in the narrower field of the nation is even more true when we enlarge our horizon and take in the world as a whole. In every other relation of life those who have a common interest are coming together: the politicians have their League of Nations; the men of business their international Chamber of Commerce; the working men their international Bureau of Labor and their Second and Third

<sup>1</sup> "The Church and Christian Education," The Gothic Press, New York, 1925.

International. But when last August the teachers of the world met in Edinburgh to discuss what they could contribute to the cause of international good will, two subjects and only two were barred out: politics and religion. Here again may we not say, "It would be incredible if it were not true."

What, then, can we who are seminary teachers do to meet the demands which the new century is making upon us? Two things at least lie clearly within our province. We can take inventory of our resources. We can resolve at any cost of personal sacrifice to make the most effective use of the resources we have.

And first of our resources. Four great movements characterize the life of our time which bear directly upon the work of the theological teacher and furnish the material which is essential to his highest success.

First of all, I should put what is sometimes called the social gospel. Often contrasted with the missionary movement as if it represented a different principle, it is in truth simply its logical outcome and necessary complement. The social gospel is the attempt to draw the consequences for Christianity of the new conception of personality which is the result of the social studies of the last two generations. It is the attempt to restate the ideal of Christian missions in terms large enough to include all the relationships of the Christian life. This conception of Christian duty found classical expression at Stockholm in that notable passage in the message in which the Conference pledged themselves in the presence of the Cross to apply the principles of Christ in all the relations of life: social, economical, racial, political, international. In this enlarged conception of the church's responsibility, the theological teacher finds a point of contact with the most progressive social thought of our time.

The second important asset is the movement for Christian unity in its various forms—local, national, international. This is one of the most impressive developments in recent

Christian history. Face to face with the gigantic problems presented by the modern world, earnest men and women in all the churches have felt the need of presenting a united front and have devised various methods through which this result may be brought about. In the local community through federations of churches or the Community Church; in the nation through the Federal Council; in administrative matters through organizations like the Home Missions Council or the Foreign Missions Conference; in the international field through gatherings like the Conference on Faith and Order or the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Christians have been able to rise above the differences that separate them and to give visible expression to their unity in Christ.

This drawing together of Christians of different names is not merely a device for meeting a practical need. A new conception of the basis of Christian unity finds expression in the movement; a new philosophy of the church is being worked out. Where the older theology presented the alternative of submission or revolt, the newer theology finds in federation the solution of the problem of unity in variety.

The third tendency of which the modern seminary needs to take account is the movement for religious education. Younger than either of the preceding, this most recent child of the new day gives every evidence of vigor and self-confidence. It is seriously addressing itself to the task in which American Protestantism has up to the present time most signally failed—the education of the children of the church. In a democracy like the United States it is the lay men and women into whom these children are to grow up who will ultimately determine the policy of the church. What they wish they will have; and no ministry can hope to maintain its own standards which does not educate the congregations to which it ministers to sympathize with its own aspirations and ideals. This the ministry of the present day has lamentably failed to do. This failure the men and

women who are specializing in religious education are trying to correct. They are attempting to visualize the educational problem of the country as a whole and to unite all available agencies in its solution.

The last of the four allies to which I have referred, I mention with diffidence, for I realize that to not a few of those to whom I am speaking it will appear not as an ally, but as an adversary. I refer to the Fundamentalist Movement. I realize quite as keenly as anyone here present the limitations of this movement and the serious criticism to which it is open both from the point of view of *intelligence* and of *spirit*. Nevertheless, I believe that taken in the large it sounds a needed note of warning and recalls to our attention a phase of the religious experience that we have been tempted too often to neglect. I refer to the element of mystery in religion—the consciousness of standing in an august presence, where criticism is an impertinence and adoration alone is in place. We miss this note in much of the newer theology. Christianity is reduced to a form of social ethics in which the service of man has pushed into the background the worship of God. We need to recover again the note of authority in the older religion—the sense of a “needs must” that dominated the entire personality, and made of the preaching of the gospel an inward necessity that could brook no denial. In reminding us of this neglected phase of our religion, the Fundamentalists are rendering a needed service. They are summoning the church to reexamine its gospel to see whether it be indeed adequate to meet the need of a world in sin.

Individual teachers are going much to adjust their teaching to this situation. They are dealing, each in their own way with each of these contemporary tendencies. Individual institutions are making provision for instruction in the fields they cover. But it can not be said that our seminaries as a whole have adequately taken account of the revolution through which modern thought has been passing,

or adequately addressed themselves to the problems of the contemporary church. Much of our instruction still follows the older lines. Where the newer interests are dealt with, it is usually through special courses crowded into the already overburdened curriculum at the expense of hours which can ill be spared from other courses. What is needed is not so much the addition of new courses as the revision of the entire theological curriculum in the light of the new knowledge and the new need.

There is nothing surprising in this state of things. It is only a reflex in the field of theology of conditions which obtain in the educational world at large. Our knowledge has increased faster than we have been able to assimilate it, and with the multiplication of special disciplines a comprehensive and balanced world view has become increasingly difficult. The rapid spread of the elective system is due not simply to the desire of students to have more to say as to the choice of their studies, but to the realization on the part of their professors that they lack the ability to advise them wisely. In academic circles, as in the economic England of Adam Smith, competition has become the prevailing law.

We are witnessing a reaction against this unregulated freedom. From many quarters we hear the demand for greater concentration, for a more unified curriculum. But with the increasing complexity of the problems to be solved it is easier to set up this ideal than to realize it.

One obvious distinction we may make at the outset, namely, between the function of the teacher and that of the scholar. It is the teacher's primary duty to correlate and transmit the fund of knowledge and experience which we have already acquired. It is the business of the scholar to carry this knowledge further. The two functions are not incompatible, but they are distinct. They serve different purposes and call for different talents. It is the scholar's function to engage in research in each of the different realms in which our knowledge is still incomplete. For this he needs not only the critical faculty but the gift of imagina-

tion. He must try experiments, make ventures, push out into the field of the unknown; be willing to hazard guesses and to make mistakes. But the teacher is the middle-of-the-road man. He requires, above all, the judicial spirit. He must distinguish between assured results and more or less doubtful possibilities. It is his function to report the consensus of opinion up-to-date, and to synthesize this consensus in convenient and usable form. Students need both kinds of contact, but they need them in different proportions and at different times. Courses that are neither of one type nor the other are apt to fall between two stools.

Above all, both research and teaching must be controlled by the practical purpose which both alike serve, which is to make possible a fuller and more effective life. In the case of a professional school like the seminary there is the further control of the need of the particular profession in question. The seminary exists to train ministers for the Christian Church. All that is studied and all that is taught, therefore, must be related to the practical needs of the church and its higher efficiency.

It is to be feared that this controlling purpose has not dominated theological instruction as consistently as it should. The teacher has too often been content to hand down the knowledge which has been transmitted to him in the particular form in which he has received it from the tradition of the church he serves, without asking how far it is adapted to the new situation which the church is facing to-day. The scholar has concentrated his researches on the history of the church of the past, ignoring the momentous developments which are taking place in the church of to-day. We have not yet organized our teaching staff, either within the individual seminary or of the seminaries as a whole, so that the total resources which are available can be used for the needs that are most immediately important in the most effective way.

Take any one of the four fields of which I have spoken.

How many questions there are of the highest practical importance for the ministry of a working church, as to which we have not yet the definite knowledge we need. What shall we say of the Christian's duty in connection with the complicated problems presented by modern commerce and industry, the relations of capital and labor, the closed or the open shop, the relative claims of coöperation and competition, the question of hours and wages, and the like. There is a vast store of knowledge available on these subjects, but it has not yet been correlated—still less evaluated according to Christian principles, and the results formulated in convenient form for the use of the prospective minister.

Again how far is coöperation practicable between different types of Christians? Which methods have proved successful and which unsuccessful? What dangers and difficulties need to be overcome in the individual community and in the church at large? Here again there is a vast store of knowledge accessible, but it has not been coördinated and incorporated in the curriculum of the theological seminary.

And what shall we say of the whole group of problems that have been raised by the psychology of religion? How far are our present methods of education intelligent—how far mere survivals from an earlier generation? How can the new impulse received by the Christian be transmitted to others? What are the sources by which public opinion is formed and what is its place in the life of the church and of the world?

What, finally, shall we say of the reactionary movement which is sweeping over the church? How far is it due to legitimate causes; how far simply to misunderstanding which a more intelligent explanation will remove? What place shall we make in our religion for external authority and how can those to whom such authority is essential live and worship in the same institution with those of more liberal spirit? Do external authority and private judgment represent two incompatible principles, or can we make place



for both side by side in the universal church? Here are questions which can only be solved by concentrated effort carried on over long periods of time by men who are consciously working together for a common end.

This need for coördination and correlation is being felt in other fields and has given rise to foundations and institutes such as the proposed Institute of International Affairs at Johns Hopkins. I suggest that we need such an institute in the field of religion—some central foundation which can bring together scholars from all over the world to exchange views upon the various problems of applied Christianity which press upon us from every side?

But such an institute, if founded, would succeed in its attempt only in the measure that it stimulated the spirit of research in the church at large. What is needed is not so much that we should set apart a group of individuals to do the work of research that is needed, as that there should be some centre from which the responsibility for such research could be allocated to those who are fitted to discharge it, wherever they may be. There are men all over the church—some of them in our schools, others in active parishes—who have opportunities of observation and of experiment which they are not using to the full because there is no way in which the results of that observation and experiment can be properly coördinated and conserved. We need a clearing house of information, a centre into which all available knowledge can be poured, that it may be classified, evaluated and organized in form for use.

And what is true of research is true also of teaching. Here too we need coördination, in order that the time at our disposal may be used to better advantage and the energies that are now wasted may be conserved. In place of the many short courses dealing with this detail or with that, we need a few broad, comprehensive courses covering the whole field of the minister's work into which the results of the researches which are being carried on by the scholars may



from time to time be incorporated. These courses, while rigidly scientific in spirit, should yet have constant reference to the practical aim of the ministry. To borrow a phrase from a distinguished contemporary scholar, himself a critic of no mean ability, they should attempt to say "what the whole outcome of our critical studies is for the life of the modern man and woman."

As the institute of research should coördinate the work of research for the seminaries as a whole, so each seminary within the geographical area which it serves should serve as a teaching centre for the ministry of the community. Our work is not done when we have trained our graduates and sent them out into the world. Every seminary ought to feel a responsibility to keep these graduates in touch with the best results of thinking after they have gone out, to supply them with good books to read, and to gather them from time to time in institutes and summer schools where they can be kept in touch with the latest results of scholarship. Only through some such process as this, carried on systematically over the whole church, can we secure a ministry adequate to the present need and overtake some of those great areas of ignorance which have been so vividly brought to our notice by recent studies.

In the impressive message with which the Universal Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm summed up its work, there is an appeal to three groups of persons: to the young, to the workers, and to the teachers. "As Christ is the Truth," so the message runs, "so Christ's Church heartily welcomes every advance of reason and conscience among men. Particularly we would invite the coöperation of those teachers and scholars who in many special realms possess the influence and command the knowledge without which the solution of our present practical problems is impossible." It is an appeal which comes home with special force to us who are teachers of theology. In addressing ourselves to the tasks that we face in our own country and in our own

church, we are not merely doing our immediate duty; we are fitting ourselves to coöperate with our fellow Christians of other churches and of other lands in that world-wide programme of study through which alone the Church of Christ can be put in the position to fulfill its ecumenical function as the teacher of the nations. For this work of co-operation, this Seminary, by its history and traditions, is peculiarly fitted, and I am sure that it will be found playing its part manfully during the new century of service and opportunity on the threshold on which it stands.

### III

ADDRESS BY S. PARKES CADMAN, D.D., LL.D.  
BROOKLYN, N. Y., PRESIDENT OF THE  
FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE  
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN  
AMERICA

The Reverend S. Parkes Cadman, D.D., president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America spoke on Thursday afternoon without having written his address. On that account it cannot be published in full.

In a recent letter Dr. Cadman asked me to say that he emphasized in his address the fact that the Reformed Church in the United States "was always a truly inclusive and irenic church" and that "the finest traits of Christian doctrine are with your beloved communion." He stressed, also, the cultivation of the form and spirit of worship in our Church—something which he found so necessary in most of the churches of America to-day.

G. W. R.

IV  
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION  
(AN ABSTRACT)

THOMAS M. BALLIET, PH.D.

*Formerly Dean of the School of Education, University of  
New York*

Archbishop Whately a hundred years ago said that he once knew a man who "aimed, at nothing—and hit it." This is exactly what happens in religious education when its aim is not clearly conceived.

It is a striking fact that nearly two thousand years after Christianity came into the world, learned theologians are still writing books on "What is Christianity?" and "The Essence of the Christian Religion."

While this is not the place to enter upon a lengthy discussion of so large a question, it is after all necessary to sketch briefly, in outline at least, what the Christian religion is so often mistaken for in Sunday School teaching, and what it essentially is.

1. The Christian religion is not a knowledge of the geography of Palestine; yet the emphasis which this receives in some progressive Sunday schools shows that it is mistaken for religion. As it is not religion, but plain geography, it should be taught in the public day schools. Two weeks, or ten lessons, are sufficient for this purpose. I had this done in city schools of which I had charge as superintendent some years ago. It is perfectly practicable; nobody objects to it. The Churches should urge it upon school authorities.

2. Religion is not a knowledge of Hebrew history in Biblical times. Such knowledge is an aid to the under-

standing of religion, but it is not itself religion. A man might be a high authority on biblical geography and biblical history and be neither a good Jew nor a good Christian. It should therefore occupy a subordinate place in a course of religious education.

3. A knowledge of the Bible in general is not of the essence of religion. It is an essential aid but only one of many aids to religious education.

4. Religion is not creed nor dogma. If it were, only persons of considerable education could be religious. Creeds and dogmas are fallible, human theories which attempt to explain religion. Dogma has its subordinate place in religious education. It is the intellectual aspect of religion and serves to satisfy the head, while the essence of religion satisfies the heart and moves the will to act.

What, then, are the essential elements of religion the development of which must be the aim of religious education?

1. First of all is love, love of God and love of fellow man.

2. A second element in our religious nature is reverence, reverence for God and reverence for everything that is great and sublime in physical nature and in human character—"The undevout astronomer is mad." Hero worship is an important part of the religious education of the young provided they are led to select the right heroes to worship.

3. A third element in the religious nature is sympathy—sympathy which leads one to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick, etc.

4. A fourth element is mercy, absence of revenge and of hatred, readiness to forgive.

5. A fifth element is a tender conscience to control will and conduct.

6. A sixth element is faith. But faith is used in the Bible in various senses.

(1) Faith is used in the sense of trust. This is its most frequent use in the Scriptures. Trust is an emotional atti-

tude, an act of the heart, based more or less on knowledge.

(2) Faith includes love. The thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians is the familiar portrayal of the emptiness of faith without love.

(3) Faith is an act of the will. "Faith without works is dead."

(4) Faith is used in the Bible in the sense of logical conclusion, of belief based on evidence.

Unfortunately the church, throughout its whole history, has made this last sense of the word its chief, and sometimes its entire, meaning. Hence the emphasis on creeds and dogmas; hence also the divisions of Protestantism.

Jesus laid little emphasis on faith in this sense. The "unbelief" which he rebuked so severely in the Jews was the unbelief of the heart, the lack of faith in the first three senses here stated. He gave but the mildest rebuke to the doubting Thomas. "Thou believest because thou hast seen, blessed are they who believe and have not seen."

On the contrary, the church all through its history has punished heresy more severely than immorality.

As stated above, the unfortunate divisions of Protestantism are based entirely on faith in the sense of creed and dogma. There is a Baptist creed, a Presbyterian creed, a Methodist creed, and the rest, but there is no Baptist love, no Presbyterian love, no Catholic love, etc. The churches have never divided on the essence of religion, only upon its wholly secondary or subordinate element as expressed in creed and dogma.

To summarize, the essential elements in religion are: love; sympathy; reverence; mercy and forgiveness; a tender conscience; faith in the sense of trust in God, right life—in general the "fruits of the spirit" as Paul enumerates them. Religion is a way of life. Religion is divine, unchanging except as it reaches higher and higher levels with the progressive development of the individual and the race. On the contrary, creed and dogma are human and fallible,

and must change with the progress of human knowledge. The conflict is not between science and religion but between science and theology, that is, between two fallible, human sciences.

With this brief, crude analysis it becomes clear what the aim of religious education must be. It must be the development of the religious nature, the development of the child's love, his reverence for God and everything that is great in nature and in human character, his conscience, his sympathy, his will. As the feelings are the mainsprings of conduct, and religion is primarily an activity of the heart, religious education is fundamentally nurture, and its appeals must be made through the imagination to the heart.

#### METHOD

This aim brings us to the question of method and of means. It is at this point where our best Sunday school work makes a fundamental mistake by imitating quite closely the method and organization of the public school which deals primarily with secular instruction. Many of our Sunday schools have a kindergarten, followed by eight grades, and a high school department. Sometimes they have even examinations for promotion from grade to grade, a mischievous feature which was discarded in the best public schools over thirty years ago. How can you examine a pupil to determine the strength of his love for God and man, his reverence for God, his sympathy for the unfortunate? An examination may be a crude test of the head, it cannot be made a test of the heart. It simply serves to place the emphasis on mere knowledge and to that extent to vitiate the teaching.

The chief aim of the secular school is knowledge, intellectual development; the development of the child's heart is in fact, even when it is not in theory, a secondary aim.

In intellectual education the pupil must be trained to observe, to grasp facts accurately, to analyze them, classify

them, compare them, draw inferences from them, and test his inferences by applying them to other facts and situations of similar character. In short, the method must be one of observation, analysis, induction and deduction. It is here where the so-called "project method" belongs, which is by many advocated for the Sunday school. Its purpose is to create interest by presenting knowledge in the form of problems to be solved. It corresponds to the "Case Method" in our law schools. It is impossible to reach the heart by induction and deduction and by any "project method," except to a slight degree and very indirectly.

There is only one subject taught in the secular school which should be taught by the same method as religion. That subject is literature. And the unfortunate thing is that this is perhaps the least effectively taught subject in the schools. Teachers very generally, in elementary schools, in high schools, and in our colleges as well, attempt to teach it by the method of science teaching; that is to say, they analyze it to shreds, draw all sorts of "lessons" and inferences from it; often they lay more emphasis on the rubbish of pedantic footnotes, unimportant historical allusions, etymology of words, etc., than on the content of the text.

Literature is art. It is the product of feeling and imagination, its appeal must be made to the emotions and the will through the imagination. It deals with the concrete, and with general truths only as embodied in concrete situations. Its purpose is inspiration, not analytic thought; the portrayal of concrete ideals, not the development of abstract ideas.

Now, the Bible is literature and must be taught by the method of literature not by the method of science teaching.

1. Literature presents concrete pictures and situations which make their appeal to the emotions through the imagination. This is emphatically true of the Bible. It presents general truths in concrete, individual situations, not in their cold abstract nakedness. This is illustrated by the



stories of the old Testament, by the imagery of the prophets and the Psalms, but especially by the incomparable parables of our Lord which have touched the hearts of men for nearly two thousand years.

Religious instruction must therefore be concrete, and the younger the child the truer this is.

2. A poem, a story, a drama is a work of art, like a great painting or a great statue. It must be presented so that it can readily be grasped as a whole. When it cannot be presented in one lesson, it must be presented in large units, so that the relations of the parts may be seen and the whole be grasped with the parts still vividly in mind. Briefly stated, at each lesson the teaching must present a maximum amount of the text with a minimum of necessary explanation, instead of a minimum amount of the text with a maximum amount of needless explanation. It is on this point that the classics edited for day school use, and the "Lesson Leaves" prepared for our Sunday schools go wrong. Few people know the interest one feels in reading one of the gospels at one sitting. The division of the Bible into chapters and verses has misled people into reading it at most a chapter at a time, and using specific verses only as subjects for moralizing to the young or as proof texts for their favorite dogmas. A play of Shakespeare is a work of art, and Shakespeare intended that it should all be presented at one time on the stage. He never imagined that his plays would be annotated, with the notes more bulky than the text, or that they would be analyzed to shreds in classroom in high school and in college, and given to the "audience" at the rate of seventy-five lines a lesson, two or three times a week. St. Paul would be amazed if he could see the many volumes in our theological libraries required to explain the sense of one of his letters, addressed, for the most part, to Christians most of whom could neither read nor write.

3. The most effective interpretation of a great poem or

of a lofty, powerful passage of literary prose, is the artistic oral reading of it to the class, with a minimum of necessary explanation. The most effective interpretation of Hamlet is not a class-room lecture in college but a rendering on the stage by an Edwin Booth. We entirely underestimate the oral reading of a chapter of the Bible without comment in public schools at the opening exercises by the teacher. The common belief is, even among Protestant ministers, that such reading without explanation is of little value. On the contrary, what makes it effective is the fact that the teacher is not allowed to come between the Biblical message and the children with his comments. He is obliged to give Jesus and Paul a chance to speak directly to the children. If we could eliminate seventy-five per cent. of the explanations of the lesson in our Sunday schools we should improve the teaching.

Reading carefully selected passages of the Bible to the children in a reverent effective way, with only absolutely necessary explanations, must be made the chief part of Sunday school teaching. If read well, literature interprets itself; the reading is the interpretation. Its meaning must be felt, not merely intellectually apprehended. Take the twenty-third Psalm. All that is necessary is a very brief explanation of shepherd life in Palestine, and a statement of the fact that Palestine has a dry season when water is scarce, followed by the most effective reading of it by the teacher. It should be read a number of times to the class. If well done each reading should intensify the interest. Then it should be read by members of the class. Questions asked by the class should in all cases be answered. But drawn out "explanations" pointing out "applications" and "practical lessons" to be learned, such as are common in Sunday schools, are simply a process of turning wine into water. The reading must make the children *feel* its meaning. The memorizing of it after hearing it read, or rather by hearing it read, is the most valuable feature of all.

We have been addressing the head instead of the heart in Sunday school; and we have not always even reached the head; we must change about and aim at the heart. We can do it by teaching the Bible as literature by the methods of teaching literature, and making Biblical geography, Biblical history of the old Testament at least, subordinate; and we must eliminate from Sunday schools where it still exists all searching for Biblical "puzzles" and other trivial material, sometimes spoken of as "Curiosities of the Bible." In 1882 a book with this title was published which Bishop Vincent dignified by writing an introduction to, and which was for years widely used by Sunday school teachers. I have a copy of it in my library which I keep as a curiosity of Sunday school teaching.

#### ORGANIZATION

As the Sunday school now imitates the secular school in method, so it also imitates it in organization into grades.

The elementary day school has eight grades; and in the best schools there are grades within grades, so as to classify pupils more effectually according to their native ability and their acquired knowledge. When the aim of instruction is knowledge, children must be closely graded so that only those of the same capacity for comprehension are placed in the same class.

When Sunday school instruction aims primarily at the head it naturally follows the same grading, and this is what it actually is doing in Sunday schools at the present time which are often held up as models.

When, however, religious education aims primarily at the heart and the will, all this changes. All persons are far more nearly alike in their emotions than in their power of thinking. This is true of adults as well as of children. Furthermore, difference in age causes less difference in the emotional life of children than in their intellectual life.

Consequently, the Sunday school should be graded with

reference to the relative maturity of their emotional nature rather than with reference to their intellectual maturity. From this it follows that the grading in our Sunday schools need not be nearly so close as in our secular schools.

Adolescence makes the most marked emotional changes, and preadolescent children should not be grouped with adolescents. And promotions, or transfers, from grade to grade should be determined on the basis of emotional maturity and not on the basis of intellectual attainments.

#### SIZE OF CLASSES

For intellectual instruction not only close grading is necessary but also relatively small classes. One of the evils of public schools is the fact that classes are generally too large. For religious instruction, however, which aims at the heart and makes its appeal through the imagination, it is a distinct advantage to have relatively large classes, the exact size of which depends a good deal on the ability and magnetism of the teacher.

The smaller the group you are addressing the easier it is to make them think, but the harder it is to move their feelings. On the other hand, the larger the group the easier it is to move them to tears or to laughter but the harder it is to make them think. A funny story which would only cause a smile when told to a group of two or three convulses a crowd.

This is a bit of practical psychology which has been entirely overlooked by writers on religious education.

We have the striking fact that, while both are supposed to be engaged in religious education, the teachers of the Sunday school clamor for small classes while the minister is all the time praying for a larger congregation! The minister is right and the teachers are wrong. We have even erected special buildings for the Sunday school in which a general assembly room is surrounded by a series of pigeon holes for small classes!

By changing the character of our Sunday school work so as to make our appeal primarily to the imagination and the heart, and only secondarily to the head, and grading the school on the basis of emotional maturity, we shall need fewer grades and we can handle much larger classes. In consequence we can get along with far fewer teachers, and these teachers can be, and must be, better qualified. We shall never, even in wealthy churches, be able to provide especially trained teachers so long as we keep the classes small, requiring many teachers.

#### ADOLESCENTS

From the age of approximately thirteen, up to eighteen, boys and girls change in their emotional life quite radically and also in their mental life and their outlook upon the world. The change in their religious life is quite as great. Religion gets its strongest hold upon the human soul during this period. The period from twelve to eighteen has in all ages been the period when people have joined the church in large numbers. Altruism blossoms out at this period and must be captured for high and noble aims.

At this time there develops normally also a deep interest in practical ethical questions. Children at this age want to know the reason why. It is here where ethical and theological discussion, not for its own sake as one would discuss a problem in physics or mathematics but to satisfy a seriously felt practical need, belongs.

But even here the reading to the class of the most precious passages, especially of the new Testament, should form a large part of the instruction.

#### THE ADULT CLASS

The Sunday school exists primarily for children and youth, and it should therefore be organized first of all with a view to their needs. It is possible to have a good Sunday school without adult classes, but it is not possible to have

one at all without children. The needs of the adult class should therefore not be allowed to dominate the school. But it is desirable to have adult classes and to provide for them.

The instruction of adult classes may properly be of a more intellectual nature than that of children. Their character is formed, and they have wider intellectual interests. Questions of practical ethics, practical theological questions, the accepted results of Biblical criticism, Apostolic church history, a sketch of the history of dogma, and the systematic study of certain books of the Bible; these are among the subjects which would interest adult classes.

#### NON-BIBLICAL MATERIAL

Considerable use with young and old should be made of literature not ordinarily classed as sacred. The reading of the life, trial and death of Socrates, as told in Plato's *Apology*, *Crito* and *Phaedo*; the life of Savonarola, of Francis of Assissi, of Luther, and of some modern characters; English and American poetry which expresses the religious longings and experiences of the heart, and some of the finest prose on religious themes—all should be freely used.

## V

### GREETINGS—NEW BRUNSWICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY PROFESSOR JOHN H. RAVEN, D.D.

It is a rare privilege which is mine to-day to bring the felicitations of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary to this ancient school of the prophets on its centennial. President Demarest of our Seminary regrets exceedingly his inability to bear these greetings in person. Nothing less than an important meeting of our Board of Directors would be allowed to prevent his attendance. He requested me to take his place to-day since, by the many losses which have occurred recently in our Faculty, I have become the Senior Professor. It is the greater pleasure to accept this invitation because the contacts between your branch of the Reformed Church and ours, as between your Seminary and ours, are so many and so intimate. The names, Reformed Church in the United States and Reformed Church in America are so nearly synonymous that popular usage still distinguishes them as the German Reformed Church and the Dutch Reformed Church. This likeness of name means that we have a common heritage. Perhaps the greatest present evidence of this is the Heidelberg Catechism, which your church recognizes as its only modern doctrinal standard, and which our church recognizes as one of its three modern standards, the Belgic Confession and the Canons of the Synod of Dort being the others. Our professors of theology sign a formula which says in part: "We the underwritten in becoming Professors of Theology in the Reformed Church in America, do by this our subscription sincerely and in good conscience before the Lord declare that we believe the Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ

Jesus as revealed in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and as set forth in the Standards of the Reformed Church in America. We believe that these Standards agree with the Word of God and we reject all errors which are contrary thereto." We cannot claim that the Heidelberg Catechism is our only doctrinal standard. Nevertheless it is no disparagement to the other standards but simple truth to say that it exerts more influence on the life of our church than either of them. Our constitution requires that "every minister must explain at an ordinary service on the Lord's Day the points of doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism so that the exposition may be completed within the term of four years." This fact, as well as the use of this catechism or the Compendium of the Christian Religion which is based upon it in our Sunday Schools and catechetical classes, gives an influence to the Heidelberg Catechism which is not exerted by either of our other standards. The personal and experimental character of this catechism and its clear statements of the Christian faith justify us in calling it "the crown and glory of the Reformed Church." Although we of the Reformed Church in America, who trace our history to the Netherlands, regard it as our very own, we owe it to you, for it was produced at the instigation of the Elector Frederick III by two young men whom he selected—Zacharias Ursinus and Caspar Olevianus. At that time the relation between Holland and the Reformed Churches of Germany was very close. In 1562 during the war in the Netherlands the Elector Frederick received Dutch fugitives, many of whom settled at Frankenthal which had a Dutch as well as a French church. Later there were such churches at Heidelberg, at Worms and other smaller places. Although these Dutch settlers returned to their home when the war was over, they left their impress upon the German Reformed Churches.

The relations of our two churches on this side of the ocean were equally close. The mother of William Penn,



Margaret Jasper, was the daughter of a Rotterdam merchant and was brought up in the Reformed faith. Perhaps this fact made the Quakers more friendly to the Germans from the Palatinate who came to America in considerable numbers in the beginning of the eighteenth century. In 1709 four thousand of them embarked for New York under the auspices of Queen Anne. Some settled in the Mohawk Valley and other parts of New York, some in Hunterdon County, New Jersey, but others in Pennsylvania. Some of the churches founded by them in the Mohawk Valley are still on the roll of the Dutch Church. From 1730 until 1793 the German Reformed Churches of Pennsylvania were controlled by the Classis of Amsterdam, as the Dutch Churches were until 1771, and the pioneer German ministers of that time were ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church. John Philip Boehm, who had performed ministerial services for a time without regular ordination, sought the advice of the Dutch ministers in New York, who recommended that the matter be referred to the Classis of Amsterdam. That Classis replied advising that he be ordained and this advice was followed when he was ordained by the Dutch ministers in New York November 23, 1729. George M. Weiss, another pioneer, who was born in the Palatinate, was ordained before he came to America. He was present at the ordination of Boehm. In 1730 Weiss and Reiff went to Holland to seek aid for the poor German churches of Pennsylvania. The Palatinate Consistory two years earlier had requested the Synod of South Holland to take charge of these churches. The Hollanders were moved by the facts which Weiss and Reiff put before them. Considerable money was raised both in North and South Holland, but especially in Amsterdam. This was the beginning of the Dutch oversight of the German churches, which, as I have said, lasted more than sixty years.

In 1746 the Synods of Holland sent out Michael Schlatter to visit the scattered churches and, if possible, effect an ec-

clesiastical organization. He landed in Boston and went directly to New York where he was cordially received by the Dutch pastors. Thence he proceeded to Philadelphia. Through his efforts in coöperation with the other German pastors, a Coetus or Synod met in Philadelphia September 29, 1747, and was attended by thirty-one ministers and elders. The poverty of the German churches continuing, the Coetus in 1751 requested Schlatter to go to Europe to secure funds for their relief. He carried out this commission very successfully. No less than £12,000 was raised in Holland and invested for the benefit of the German churches in Pennsylvania. The Synods of Holland, however, made it a condition of their gift that the Coetus was to be altogether subject to the Classis of Amsterdam and that no new ministers were to be admitted without the special consent of that Classis. Following out these conditions the Coetus sent full minutes of its proceedings annually to Holland. The Classis of Amsterdam considered every question with great care and did not hesitate to reverse the acts of the Coetus if they did not meet their approval. The annual income came regularly from Holland and was a great aid to the churches. In spite of this it is natural that they gradually became more and more dissatisfied with foreign control. In 1771, when the Dutch churches in New York and New Jersey were about to declare for independence they invited the Germans to unite with them. The Coetus in Pennsylvania declined this invitation because of their gratitude to their benefactors in Holland. However, in 1772 the Coetus declared their right of ordination which the Classis of Amsterdam had refused them, but resolved to continue to send to Holland a report of their proceedings as a matter of courtesy but not for revision. This condition continued until 1792 when the Synod held its first meeting in Lancaster as an independent body.

With such a long period when the German churches were a part of the Dutch Reformed Church it is not surprising

that there have been repeated movements toward the union—or perhaps I should say—reunion of the two bodies. In 1803 Dr. John H. Livingston, a graduate of Yale who studied also at the University of Utrecht, who deserves to be called the founder of the Dutch Reformed Church in America as an independent body and was our first Professor of Theology, wrote to the German Synod suggesting a fraternal correspondence between the two churches. This proposition was accepted unanimously and the correspondence thus happily begun has continued to the present day.

In 1818 when the Germans were considering plans for a theological seminary, an overture was presented from the Dutch Synod by Rev. Peter Labagh that the Germans should unite with the Dutch in support of the theological seminary at New Brunswick. The Synod replied that it already had a share in an institution at Lancaster which it wished to sustain. In 1820 Dr. Philip Milledoler of New York was the representative of the Dutch Reformed Church at the Synod of the German Reformed Church in Hagerstown, Md. He began his ministry in the German Reformed Church and was highly esteemed therein. This esteem found expression in his election as Professor of Theology in the German Seminary. He was evidently attracted greatly by the call, and for a time he was inclined to accept, but after two years of consideration, finally declined. This is especially interesting because three years later, in 1825, the year of the founding of your seminary, when the venerable John H. Livingston died, Dr. Milledoler was elected Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick and President of Rutgers College. He held these honorable positions until 1841.

The record of the relation between our two branches of the Reformed Church would not be complete if I failed to mention Dr. Joseph F. Berg, who after an honorable ministry in the German Reformed Church and a pastorate in the Dutch Reformed Church in Philadelphia, was elected Pro-

fessor of Theology at New Brunswick. There he served with credit until his death ten years later (1861-1871). One of his sons entered the ministry and three of his grandsons are now ministers of the Reformed Church in America, one of them having been for several years the New Testament Professor at New Brunswick.

This outline of the relation between the German and Dutch Reformed Churches is not presented merely to justify my part in the program of to-day. It is rather to show the sincerity and earnestness of the greetings which I bring you from New Brunswick. Whatever be our names and whatever differences there may be in our theological views, we are engaged in a common cause. That which binds us together is far stronger than that which separates us. However much we glory in the name Reformed and in our common heritage, we glory far more in the name of Jesus Christ and in His cross. So, while to-day we thank God for all that He has wrought through the fathers and through us, we look forward with sublime confidence to better times ahead—at last to the coming of the Kingdom of God which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. In this sublime consummation we believe that your Seminary and ours shall have an important part.

## VI

### GREETINGS—THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PRINCE- TON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT J. ROSS STEVENSON

*President Richards, Faculty, Trustees and friends of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States:* It is an honor and privilege to bring to this venerable institution the greetings of her more aged sister. Although Princeton Seminary began her official career one hundred and thirteen years ago, she claims to be a lineal descendant of the old Log College at Neshaminy, where William Tennant gathered a group of young men for theological training as early as 1739. That enterprise was merged into the life of the College of New Jersey, which institution maintained a chair of divinity up to the time when the Seminary was organized. This chair was occupied by the President of the College. To it Jonathan Edwards was called. John Witherspoon who in his day filled the chair is entitled to undying fame on two accounts. He signed the Declaration of American Independence and introduced into the American class-room the study of Hebrew. Few students associate their struggle to master the original language of the Old Testament with "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The Seminaries of a hundred years ago owe their organization in the main to "the great awakening of 1800" and the consequent demand for Christian leadership. The plan of Princeton Seminary, copied in large part by institutions of subsequent foundation, was prepared by churchmen, by active pastors, whose aim was to train a succession of ministers possessed with a spirit of "the primitive propagators of the Gospel, prepared to make every sacrifice, to endure every

hardship and to render every service which the promotion of pure and undefiled religion may require." These early institutions were intended to train church leaders who "are friends of revivals of religion and imbued with the missionary spirit." The first President of our Board of Foreign Missions was Samuel Miller, one of the original professors in the Seminary. They realized even then the value of co-operative effort and although denominational schools were organized, they were imbued with an interdenominational spirit. In all her history, Princeton Seminary has simply required of entering students testimonials as to Christian character and proper academic standing. Last year, no less than twenty-nine denominations were represented in our student body. Our common history has demonstrated the necessary union of sound learning with vital piety. We need not concern ourselves at present with the fear that too much learning on the part of Seminary graduates will make their message incomprehensible. The general complaint of the pew is against a dearth of ideas in the pulpit. There is a tradition in Princeton to the effect that the Witherspoon Street Colored Presbyterian Church, supplied by the Seminary students Sabbath after Sabbath, on one occasion when no student was available, was able to secure Dr. Archibald Alexander as a supply for the day. One of the older members of the church, an ex-slave, was heard to remark that "this old unlearned preacher" suited him better than the students because he could understand every word that was spoken.

We rejoice in the achievement of this worthy institution in the direction of a well-trained church leadership. We congratulate Dr. Richards and his associates in view of present prosperity and larger hopes, and as he was brought hither the old family arm chair as a symbol of what the coming years may mean to him, let me as the President of the older institution simply say "Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be."

## VII

### GREETINGS—THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MOUNT AIRY, PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER 2, 1925

PRESIDENT HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.

No one acquainted with the Church History of this Commonwealth would venture to deny a close relationship which has existed for fully two centuries between the Reformed Church, the centennial of whose theological school we are now celebrating and the Lutheran Church on the same territory, for whose seminary it is my privilege to speak. Notwithstanding important difference, there is much that we have in common. The founders of these two churches and the multitudes whom they gathered with their congregations in colonial days, were, as a rule, near neighbors in the lands whence they emigrated. We came from the same race; spoke the same language, modified by the same dialectic variations; had been subjects of the same rulers, and had lived under the same governments. They had been exposed to the same calamities of climate and war, and the same persecutions for their faith from the same enemies. They were outspoken in the confessions not only of a common Protestantism, but also of a common Christian faith which came from the same open Bible under the illumination of the same Holy Spirit. They rejoiced in the same evangelical freedom which the Reformation had brought. Neighbors in their old homes, with separate congregations, maintaining, amidst the same generic resemblances, specific differences, they came to these shores, often on the same vessels to be prepared together for the privileges of American citizenship and the organization and administration of a free church in a free land.



In founding new families, the youths of our congregations, young men and maidens, crossed ecclesiastical lines, without, for a moment imagining that either had renounced the Christian faith, because of divergences in the Catechism wherein they had been instructed. So it has come to pass that in the ministry of the Lutheran Church, there is a long list of pastors and teachers, who are thankful to God for their Reformed ancestry, as there are those also of the Reformed Church who cannot help feeling kindly to the Lutheran Church, because of a mother or grandmother who has had much to do with their religious training.

Were there not a deep underlying basis which justifies such resemblances, the present speaker would be strangely out of place in this celebration; and yet since both his grandmothers were born and reared in the Reformed Church, he can claim a part in your inheritance, and rejoice in this celebration with you as that also of the Church of his own fathers.

It was because the faith of her childhood found rich nourishment in the Gospel as she afterwards heard it taught in the Lutheran Church, that one of these devout women could remind her grandson: "You are a Lutheran because you could not help it; for you are so by birth. But I had my own free choice, and I am a Lutheran by conviction." And yet, as in numberless other cases, the exercise of free choice, carried with it none but the kindest feelings towards those within whose midst and under whose instruction, she had first learned to know Christ. This Seminary has had a long and varied history. It has called into its service scholars of distinction from other denominations and from Europe. It has sent forth, we are told, a thousand or more pastors with the ministry. It has diligently cultivated theological literature. Candor compels us to recognize the fact that its theologians and those of the school which I represent, have been at times allies, and at other times antagonists. They have stood together for funda-



mental truths, and in warring against some of the same errors and abuses; they have also both had the courage of their convictions in publishing to the world certain points of difference. The close relationship which existed between such religious leaders as Henry Melchior Muhlenberg and Michael Schlatter, was based upon nothing less than a clear recognition of certain firmly established principles, for which each esteemed the other. This relationship has been repeatedly reproduced in our two Faculties. The only time I had the privilege of seeing the venerable Dr. John W. Nevin, for so many years the head of your seminary, was in this city, when he visited the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania, then in session in old Trinity Church, where he was introduced by my predecessor, Dr. Charles Porterfield Kranth, and a warm tribute paid to his character, scholarship and eminent services. This Seminary has the credit of giving to theological circles in America, and to English theological literature, Dr. Philip Schaff, the great international and interdenominational scholar and churchman, whose intimacy with Dr. William J. Mann of our Seminary was unbroken from early youth until death, and who for years coöperated as editors in the influential *Kirchenfreund*. Dr. Mann himself was for some years a Reformed pastor in Philadelphia.

If I may get a personal allusion, I may say that, on my election to the professorship I continue to hold, I was much gratified by a very prompt note of congratulation from Dr. Schaff, in which he said that speaking as a Presbyterian,—for he was then at Union Seminary, he would have to say: "You have been predestined for that chair." This was the beginning of a number of kind offices from the same source, the last of which was within only a few days of his death.

Nor should I fail to refer to the edification received to-day by our congregations from the hymns of Dr. Henry

Harbaugh in our "Common Service Book," especially "Jesus, I live to thee, The loveliest and best." The more the language and spirit of that hymn become those of the hearts of all our pastors and people, the nearer will be our approach to one another and the more efficient will be our coöperation in every good word and work.

## VIII

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION WITH THE EMPHASIS ON MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE

PROFESSOR RUFUS M. JONES, D.D., LL.D.

*Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.*

Our educational systems for the last two hundred years have been primarily concerned with practical results. They have been keyed to produce persons who could find the resources of nature and who could *do* the things that needed to be done in our world. This educational policy has been subtly and unconsciously preparing the way for the theory that man's specific "behavior" is the only matter of importance about him. His interior life is negligible and may be shelved without being seriously missed. The emphasis in education has been acutely, even thumpingly, scientific. The leaders of thought have been out for the conquest and control of the external world. They have cashed in immense results. Every form and type of exact research has been quickened and perfected. The atom has opened up its mysteries in this century as the solar system did in the seventeenth. We have counted forty thousand gigantic suns in the space occupied by what the ancient world believed to be "the seven stars" of the Pleiades. We have cut down through the mounds which mark the sites of Ur and Babylon, Jericho and Gibeah and we now know not only what kind of pottery they used in the different stages of their development but we also know in pretty full detail the characteristics of their civilization back to the dawn of their organized social life. Not satisfied with interlacing the entire world with cables and wires of electric communication we have now learned how to vibrate our music and our words across wireless spaces, through mountains and

oceans so that soon the entire population of the United States can hear the President read his inaugural address. No oil is too deep or too remote to elude us. We ransack the poles for economic resources. We say to mountains, if they are in our way, "Be removed and be cast into the sea." We have refined the methods of warfare until guns and cannon seem as crude as Maori spears or Zulu arrows. We can kill now with poisons which leave no wounds and perhaps in time they will leave no mourners! The emphasis, I say, has been on methods of education that would promote the conquest and control of external nature and that would prepare persons who could *do* things successfully. There is no question about the results. The methods have *worked*. We can fly. We can travel at enormous speed. We can talk around the world. We can see what is happening on the surface of the sun and we are near neighbors with "King Tut."

But unfortunately this conquest of the external world does not make us better men. We are not any more "at home" with our universe than in the ages when men's sight was more limited and their voices carried less far. Our losses and agonies and perplexities are just as baffling and as hard to bear as when speeds were confined to ten miles an hour. It is not much comfort to a man to know that he could buy the whole of Palestine as it was in Christ's day and not feel the outlay much more than he feels paying his income tax, if with this accumulation of goods he is missing all of the peace and joy of life which Christ promised men. We quite obviously need to bring up the neglected side of life and to consider more seriously than we have done a type of education which will enable us to find *ourselves* and to recover interior peace and joy and power.

I shall admit at once that I have no ready-made technique to propose for this new education. I shall not solve the problem by laying down here a magic method by which we can all become saints and prophets. I am weary of short-

cut and "labor-saving" schemes which promise to give us millenniums by "limited express"—what the French happily call, "*grande vitesse*." It is the business not of one man but of the combined educational forces, coöperating through years of experience and experiment, to give us a successful technique for our new education. It is merely my humble purpose now to drive home the fact that our present education is one-sided, inadequate and pitifully neglectful of the inner life—the making of persons—and to indicate the lines along which the new education should move, if it is to correct the false emphasis.

First of all we must push education, and all that we mean by spiritual culture, very much farther back toward the head waters of the child's life. Very often the boy's chance for a truly, genuinely religious life has been lost before what we usually call his "education" has begun. Many of our native capacities are transitory; they fade away and become atrophied and functionless if they are "starved" at the period when they "ripen" and call for stimulus and activity. Fortunately the religious capacity is not as short-lived in most of us as are many of our instincts, but it is nevertheless true that the impulse and urge to correspond with the unseen and the beyond appear very early in life and they are profoundly, though of course unconsciously, affected by suggestion and by the social atmosphere of the family life and the child's group-life. What we vaguely call "temperament" and "disposition" are much more important matters for an individual's life than are houses or lands or bank accounts. There is no doubt a hereditary factor which plays a part in shaping these subtle inner aspects of character, but they are in large degree determined by the social environment in which the early formative years are passed. The methods of discipline which meet the child's moods and acts, the personal quality of the lives of those who deal most closely with him, surrounding influences of beauty and love, or the lack of them, the presence,

or the absence, of nervous frictions and irritations, sympathetic and understanding appreciation of what is going on in the developing mind and heart, in a word, the atmosphere, the invisible spirit, of the home—these are the great forces which form the disposition and temperament of the child. If we were anything like as much concerned to discover these methods and processes, and the technique of this creative business, as we are to discover the laws of chemical composition we should soon have a valuable body of principles for the guidance of those who are the moral and spiritual guardians of little children.

The great religious races, notably the Hebrews and the Greeks, have been great adepts in the cultivation of the imagination of their children. Imagination is a mental capacity of the first importance for every aspect of life, but peculiarly so for religion. The power to *see*, to forecast, to anticipate, to discover and to value what is implicated or involved in the normal experiences of life, is an essential capacity for expanding life. It is what the New Testament means by *faith*. It is fully as important as that power to apprehend and describe *facts*, which we have learned how to train with much success. But matter of fact people as we incline to be, we are apt to be afraid of imagination. We assume that it has to do with "what isn't there," with the world of illusion and hallucination, with exaggeration and untruth. It is, however, a gift of major rank—this faculty of vision, this capacity to feel realities which elude the senses, but which are there for seeing souls and for "the single eye." It is as necessary for religion as the power to see perspective is for drawing, and it is no more difficult to cultivate than is the latter. But we have not done it, we do not do it. We train children to see and to dodge passing automobiles, a skill which is essential to survival, but we neglect the cultivation of the capacity to *see the invisible*, which is essential to art, to poetry and to religion. I am advocating no slackening of attention to the automobile, but

only more attention to the subtler realities which form and build the dimensions of the soul.

One of the most important features of early education is the organization of the instincts and emotions and the formation of loyalties. Most of our coarser primitive instincts, such as fear, hate, anger, and the springs of action which concern the ego, are stronger than are actually needed for survival and for development. They must not of course be eliminated, but they need to be refined and sublimated. This is best done by taking them up and fusing them into wider "systems of interest," which include others than the self. "Play" concerns more than one. It involves some sort of common rules, habits and ends to be accomplished. No one can learn to "play" without coördinating with others, without give and take, without some degree of submission, or without forecasting purposes which draw upon instinct, emotion, interest, imagination and ingenuity. From "play" it is possible to pass to higher and wider unities of purpose which will organize more springs of action around a central aim and so develop a loyalty-system. Loyalty to mother and to father, loyalty to little chosen tasks and purposes, loyalty to the play-group, to the home-group, are good foundations for the more abstract loyalties which build our lives, such as loyalty to truth, to duty, loyalty to ideals and to our Great Companion. Here are the hidings of power that underlie our morality, our faith, and our religion, and all that constitutes rich personal character. These things are all built on loyalties, and the formation of such loyalties is thus at least as important an achievement as is learning the multiplication table or becoming skilled in the right use of pronouns. Instincts have for centuries been cited as the conservative forces which entail the ancient age-long habits and the primitive traits of the race. "What has been is what shall be," and "what has been done is what shall be done," because, it is said we are creatures of instincts and emotions and those are endlessly repeatable forces, *i.e.*, the same in

all generations. Yes, but instincts and emotions need not remain forever blind, impulsive and explosive driving-engines. It is just the business of education to bring the higher motives into control of lower impulses, and out of chaotic "urges" to organize an intelligent and coöperative person whose life culminates in that over arching loyalty—loyalty to the unseen Person who is the indwelling Life of our lives.

One of the most important influences in the formative culture of the soul is the right use of great spiritual literature, especially of course the Bible. It is the best means within our reach for the cultivation of imagination. It spontaneously kindles loyalty to what is true and fine and noble, and it helps more powerfully than any other influence I know of to foster the experience of unseen things. But we use those means bunglingly, awkwardly and ineffectively. There are few more tragic blunders in the history of spiritual education than the modern Sunday School presents. It is not as effective for its purpose as the ancient Hebrew Synagogue was, or as the early Christian Catechetical School. There are, no doubt, Sunday Schools which are centres of great spiritual culture and there are single classes in many other Sunday Schools where the children find their way across the frontiers of the every day life into a world of spiritual beauty and joy and consecration. But alas, much of our Sunday School teaching is dull, uninspiring and unpedagogical. It does not impart a knowledge of the Great Book of the ages nor does it arouse a lasting love for it, or faith in its truths. The trouble frequently is that an attempt is being made to force upon the mind of the youth a certain theory of Scripture, though more often the constructive effect of the teaching is blocked by an effort to lug in a "moral" at every point, or to drive home a religious lesson from every narrative. The total effect is artificial and unnatural. The more or less recalcitrant youth do not analyze the situation. They cannot give a clear account of what is wrong with their Sunday School, but they dimly know that



something is the matter with it and that they go with lagging feet and with a lack of interest. In many cases a positive dislike of the Bible is produced, while in a multitude of cases nothing which can properly be called spiritual culture is accomplished.

If chemistry and physics were studied in the same rambling, hit-or-miss fashion which we apply to our study of Scripture we should never have discovered the truth about atoms or electricity. There is a vast amount of illuminating historical material at hand to interpret the background of the Old and the New Testament books. It is possible to know the dramatic and vital issues which are woven into the tissue of this marvellous literature of the Spirit. There is not a line in these books which does not have a deep human interest and appeal, but almost nothing of all this filters down to the teacher of our boys and girls. The dramatic and vital aspects are masked and hidden. The thrilling heroic narrative is spoiled to make place for a pious "lesson." The teacher is not an expert in kindling imagination, in imparting vision, in making the unseen real, in fascinating the hearer with the story of national struggle, personal heroism and undying loyalty. I know the difficulties of securing such expert teachers, particularly in rural communities and I know that I am calling for gifts that are none too common, but my main point is this: We have not waked up to the ominous fact that the Sunday School has gone awry, and that the immense opportunity of drawing the children and youth of our land into the higher spiritual life and into possession of an enlarged inner life and vision is being, if not lost, then certainly, bungled and misused. It ought to be a school of prophets, a place for the true culture of the soul, where the springs of the will would be raised to new power, the faith and loyalty of the heart elevated and the vision of the soul quickened for correspondence with the vast spiritual environment in which we live, or at least should live!

Few things in our present day civilization are so extra-

ordinary as the increase in the number of young men and women who secure a college or university education. No one who has the mental capacity for what we call "advanced education" need miss it. There is an institution of higher learning within reach of every community, and poverty is no longer a bar to such learning. An immense group of men and women go forth with their degrees each year into the life of the nation, and should of course be raising the entire intellectual and moral level of the population. But we get frequent suggestive intimations that the effect is not all that we have reason to expect, while occasionally we have rude awakenings to the fact that much of our so-called "higher culture" is crude and unspiritual. One has only to spend very little time in any college or university centre to see why this is so. In most cases the institutions have grown in size beyond their capacity to assimilate and to organize the raw material which pours in as to an immense knowledge-factory. The human contacts between professors and students are slight. Truth is imparted too much in wholesale fashion, as one turns on a hose. Some receive the full gush and some only the thin spray. Student bodies are great psychological masses, powerfully under the influence of group-suggestion, subject in high degree to imitation and contagion, and they live in a dizzy whirl of activities, athletics, fraternities, social festivities and extraneous aims. A good amount of honest work is done, and all our institutions graduate some excellent scholars and train some noble characters, but everywhere the emphasis is wrong and the educational waste is pitiful. In our rush for big institutions, big endowments, big numbers, big athletic victories, we have almost forgotten that the business of a college is to make moral and spiritual *persons*. We have laboratories for everything but that. The forces that should shape and mould the inner life of our students are meager and feeble. Everything here is capricious and accidental. The chapel is an antiquated spiritual weapon and the college Y. M. C. A.

is an amorphous affair. The moral and spiritual influences must be fundamental, inherent and integral in the fibre and fabric of the college life. If the classes in biology, history, psychology and philosophy disintegrate the faith of the student, it cannot be recovered and reintegrated by a spray of rosewater at chapel. The moral and spiritual life is not something apart, to be superadded to life as a kind of perfume. It must spring out of and be a vital part of the normal life and thought of the individual. The professor who teaches biology or psychology is the person who for better or worse is to give the student his spiritual bearings in that field and the influences of the class-room will make him either see, or fail to see, the religious implications of the truth he is learning. We should not wish to shackle any man's mind, or to force truth to fit into any traditional moulds, but we should insist that those who train our sons and daughters shall be *reverent interpreters of truth*, and shall be persons who feel a genuine concern for the moral and spiritual *effect* of their work upon the lives which pass under their hands. Here, again, I am simply pleading that we should wake up to the patent fact that our higher institutions of learning are weak precisely where they ought to be strong. We have built marvelous dormitories, observatories, laboratories, chapels, gymnasiums and stadiums. We have endowed professorial chairs and provided for perpetual fellowships, but we have spent very little money and much less thought on the central problem, how to build the interior lives of our students and how, out of the crude, raw material to train and develop persons who have depth of insight, clear vision and spiritual perception of the meaning of life, profound loyalties, broad comprehension, magnanimous aims, and withal an appreciation of those subtle energies of the spirit revealed within the soul.

The minister of to-day, whether in a city church or in a rural community, has a very wide sphere of duties and functions. He must touch many sides of the life of his complex

flock and he must be the leader in a great array of activities. He is much more than a "voice" crying from a pulpit. He should have organizing capacity, undoubted qualities of leadership, a grasp of social and economic problems with sense enough not to preach on these topics, some real insight of the bearing of science and history on the central realities of religion, and of course a deep and intimate knowledge of Scripture and Christian literature. But with all his "gettings," he must above everything else get a vital, first-hand acquaintance and fellowship with God. His messages must spring out of experience and be touched and fused with some real inner contact with the spiritual realm from which the soul is nourished. Seminaries where ministers are trained should, therefore, be nurseries of mystical life and experience.

The ancient emphasis on theology, which appears even in the name of most seminaries, should fall into the background and the primary emphasis should be upon training persons of deep religious life and experience with all-round spiritual leadership. Traditional theology has no more place in the thought and work of a modern preacher than a knowledge of alchemy has for a present day chemist. The nature and character of God must certainly not be left to rest on the speculations and metaphysics of remote ages. The theory of man which St. Augustine and Calvin set in the forefront of their august systems of thought must give place to a sound psychological interpretation of man's true inner nature as it really is. The unveiling of God and the revelation of man which Christ brought to light have been strangely neglected for substitute views which have a dubious pagan origin. The Galilean way of life and the truly Christian conception of God and man should be freshly presented to every person who is to be a spiritual guide in our modern world.

But besides all this, every seminary should have one or more experts in the mystical way of life. The cultivation

of the inner life must not be left to chance and accident. In using the word "expert," I mean a person who "has been there," who not only knows the literature of this field but who has seriously travelled this way of life. There should be some real experiments made in the use of silence and meditation and there should be an illuminating course in the writings and interpretations of the great mystics. Technical, historical knowledge is not enough; there is need of sympathetic, appreciative interpretation with, as I have said, some well guided attempts to practice the presence of God. In all such matters personal leadership counts for most and disciples will be pretty sure to arrive if the master himself knows and travels the way on in front.

I am not concerned to propose any technique or to outline any specific course for seminary students. My purpose here is merely to correct the emphasis. I want to see a crop of ministers produced who not only know the Bible and the history of the Church, but who know God as well, who have a warm human touch with men and at the same time are in immediate correspondence with the world within the world we see. I should like to appeal strongly for a deeper psychology of man's inner life and for a new flood of light upon the relation of the human and the divine, the finite spirit, and the environing infinite Spirit. We have spent much precious time with the husks and the fringes of spiritual truth, now the hour has struck for us to focus upon the centre and refresh ourselves with a knowledge of the innermost realities by which we live.

## IX

### THE SPIRIT OF THE SEMINARY—AN INTERPRETATION

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D.

I shall not attempt to present a history of the Seminary from its beginning in Carlisle to its present location in Lancaster; nor shall I try to define the theology taught by the Faculty in the successive stages of the Seminary's growth. Least of all shall I venture to criticise and correct, in the light of contemporary thought, the teachings of the Seminary during these hundred years.

It is appropriate, however, that reference be made at this time to the spirit which has pervaded the Seminary's doctrine and deed; in other words, to its point of view, its attitude and disposition toward ecclesiastical and theological, scientific and social issues of the times. I assume that this spirit manifests itself through the teachings of the professors and the precept and practice of the Alumni. Of course, I am mindful of the fact that there has been more than one Faculty and that each was composed of men of different temperaments, kinds of training, and degrees of scholarship. They spoke and wrote by divers portions and in divers manners in different generations—each having its own problems and tasks. Notwithstanding these differences one can discern clearly a unity and continuity of spirit and of purpose, if not of method and conclusion, pervading the men of the several Faculties and controlling their way of approach to the problems of the day.

I. The Seminary was founded, after years of hesitation, in response to the growing demand for ministers of Reformed Churches. The Missionary Committee of 1820, in

its report to the Synod, stressed the urgency of the needs of the Church. Special mention is made of congregations that were without pastoral oversight and of new fields that the Church ought to occupy; warning, also, is given against "the errors of the Socinians" and against "fanatics" who mistook "the fancies of enthusiasts for revelation and bodily exercise for godliness." In view of these conditions the Committee proposed "a theological school and a missionary establishment" as "the two pillars that must support the temple which we are commanded to build in the service of Jehovah." In the judgment of the Committee and of the Synod which adopted the Committee's report, the proposed Seminary was to provide men imbued with the spirit of missions and prepared to protect the Church against rationalism and fanaticism.

In his inaugural address, Dr. Mayer, the first professor in the Seminary, defined the two essential elements of an effective minister as "true piety" and "sound learning."

A minister in those days, both for the propagation and the defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, was trained almost continuously and exclusively in theology and philosophy proved by the Scriptures. The theological seminary was true to its name; it was the seed-plot of theology, and theology and gospel were joined together of God not to be put asunder by man. What is now designated as practical theology was, until comparatively recent times, a mere appendage to the chair of systematic theology. It is needless to say that times have changed and seminaries have changed with them. Ministers are no longer limited to the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and pastoral visitation. Now they are to be trained to become "congregational practitioners" and "community engineers" and naturally the curriculum of the seminaries has undergone an inversion of all values—*eine Umwerthung aller Werthe*. The theoretical disciplines are crowded to the wall and the practical studies are claiming the primacy.



I am simply stating a fact and not passing a judgment of values.

The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church from its beginning was profoundly theological and, in that respect, it was in full accord with the fashion of American seminaries generally. It professed, however, to expound a distinctive type of doctrine which came to be known as the Mercersburg Theology—presumably having the advantage of all other systems in that it was not only *new* but, also, absolutely *true*. Most of us still remember how we left the classic halls on the day of graduation flushed with the pride of theological superiority.

II. To understand the spirit of the Seminary we shall mention, without discussing them in detail, the factors which entered into its life. They were the following: 1. The genius of the South German Reformed Church which is expressed in classic form in the Heidelberg Catechism; a catechism which belongs to the same family as the Catechism of Geneva and the Catechism of Westminster, and yet it differs in many points from these symbols of faith. 2. The spirit of the German Reformed Church in the United States in the 18th and early 19th century, in which the confessional and churchly ideas of Boehm and the Coetus prevailed, notwithstanding certain pietistic and rationalistic elements. 3. The conditions of the political, social and religious life of America in the early national period. 4. The blending of German, English, and American theological and philosophical thought in the members of the first Faculty—Rauch the philosopher, Nevin the theologian, Schaff the historian. This was a group of men which one might hope to find in the great universities of this country or of Europe, but one would hardly expect to meet them in the then obscure village of Mercersburg and in a recently established theological seminary of a comparatively unknown Church.

They were men of firm religious convictions rooted in deep Christian experience; their irreproachable lives bearing



witness to the sincerity of their faith. Their scholarship was of the highest order and received due recognition on two continents; in their scope of vision and their sympathies they were cosmopolitan and catholic, international and interdenominational, though they were no less loyal to their Church because they were free from denominational or sectarian bigotry. These men left their impress upon the Seminary in its plastic stage and their spirit and works followed them long after they had died in the Lord.

III. The teaching of the professors in the Mercersburg period was determined largely by the issues and problems before the Christian world. It was a time of transition from one order of thought and life to another. John Fiske says: "In their mental habits, in their methods of inquiry and in the data at their command, the men of the present day who have fully kept pace with the scientific movements are separated from the men whose education ended in 1830 by an immeasurably wider gulf than has ever divided one progressive generation of men from their predecessors." Such a change of mental mood and habit amounted to the passing of an old world and the coming of a new. Old theories were disproved and new questions, touching the bases of faith and the controlling principles of philosophy, were raised. Serious men passed through travail of soul. Thomas Arnold describes the spiritual state of many another when he writes of Clough, saying: "His inner being once strongly rooted in the old-world faith and hope, had gone all awrack and could find no answer to the invading palsying doubt." About this time Newman was fog-bound on the Mediterranean and struck a responsive chord in men's hearts everywhere when he wrote, "Lead, kindly light, lead thou me on." Strauss' *Leben Jesu*, Baur's work on the Pastoral Epistles, and Vatke's *Biblical Theology Scientifically Presented*—three works that deeply influenced the New Testament study of this generation—appeared in 1835; Sir Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* in 1830, Marx and

Engels' Communist Manifesto in 1845, Marx's *Das Kapital* in 1867, Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859. These writings were both symptoms and products of a new spirit in men of light and leading. Biblical criticism, ecclesiastical dissent and sectarianism, political revolution, socialistic theories, the evolutionary hypothesis were parts of one and the same movement—the revival of humanism in the 18th century.

It was humanism, not of the literary, speculative and aesthetic type of the 15th century, but of the scientific, practical and utilitarian kind, such as would naturally follow in the wake of Francis Bacon. The scientific method was used first in the investigation of nature, then in the study of history and literature, and finally in the interpretation of religion and the Bible. Philosophy, science, art, and politics, which, since the age of Constantine, were under the supervision of the Church, declared themselves independent of religious control, and followed the voice of reason instead of revelation. Political, social, and moral sanctions were found in the reason and conscience of men rather than in the precepts of the Church or the laws of the Bible.

Thus the warfare between theology and science began. For a time, indeed, the humanists and the theologians might ignore each other, but the modern man could not continue always to keep religion and culture apart. Christian leaders were compelled to take cognizance of the legitimate claims of reason and conscience in the face of the established authority of Church and State, of criticism over against dogmatism, of free investigation over against implicit faith, of the cry for new forms of life corresponding to the experiences of a new age. Dorner says: "An antiquated theology went down to its grave, but the Christian faith remained, nay, was even now reviving with fresh vigor to bring forth in due time a new theology."

IV. In the face of these changes one might take one of three attitudes—the reactionary, the radical, the mediational.

The professors at Mercersburg belonged to the third group. They were keenly alive to the defects of the prevalent Christianity. Few, if any, theologians in America were as penetrating and as bold in their analysis and criticism of Catholicism and of Protestantism as they were. They had a distinctive viewpoint from which they surveyed the religious and political institutions of their time. They were imbued with the spirit of evangelical mediational theology of Germany; they were masters of the Scotch and the English philosophies; and they understood the Puritan and Methodist types of religion in this country. They were quick to give due recognition to the truth and goodness of all these schools and Churches and yet they were not in full accord with any of them.

Dr. Gerhart, who was first a pupil and then a colleague of the earlier Mercersburg men, defines their position when he says of Dr. Nevin: "As a result of his studies and his own observation, he was convinced that the Churches of the Reformation, transplanted to American soil, had, in great measure, given up their original faith, had come under the power of a spirit foreign to the Reformation Symbols, and were really, unwelcome as the charge was, drifting on the broad current of rationalism. The German Reformed Church, with others, had also in a great degree forsaken its own original denominational character, and subjected, in the absence of a counteracting force sufficiently strong, to the power of Puritan and Methodistic modes of thought, was rapidly undergoing a transformation into the image of a foreign system." Dr. Schaff in his Tract on the "Principle of Protestantism" called attention to the defects of supernaturalistic orthodoxy and warned the Church also against a false and uncontrolled subjectivism. "Rationalism and sectarianism," he says, "are the most dangerous enemies of our Church at the present time. They are both but different sides of the same principle, a one-sided false subjectivity sundered from the authority of the objective.

Rationalism is theoretic sectarianism; sectarianism is practical rationalism."

The remedy for these "diseases of Protestantism" was sought both in a restoration and in a completion of the evangelical ideas of the Reformation. For both the Catholic and evangelical Churches were suffering from one-sidedness and incompleteness. The latter emphasized the subjective and experimental in religion to the neglect of the objective and sacramental; the former reversed the emphasis and ignored the personal element in religion. The fontal source of error was their defective Christology or the want of a proper conception of the incarnation as affecting an organic union of the natural and the supernatural in a new creation continuing in the historical Church to the end of time. The restoration was to be not a mere replica of the formulas and institutions of the 4th or the 16th century, but a reproduction under new conditions of the normal relation of the believer to Christ, of faith to the Bible, of freedom to authority, of the individual to the Church, as these were realized in the experience of the Reformers. The completion of the Reformation was not to be a breach with evangelical principles, but an advance beyond the positions of the original Reformers, beyond confessionalism and rationalism, by the acceptance and application of truth new and old in the solution of problems in Church and State. Moreover it was fondly hoped that there might be also a reconciliation of Catholicism and Protestantism in such a way "that the truth that each includes may be saved in the union of both," resulting in what was termed Protestant-Catholicism. It was to be reconciliation, not by compromise nor by concession, but by advance of both types of Christianity to a higher plane. Thus neither reaction nor revolution—Romanism, Puseyism, rationalism, nor sectarianism,—but the progressive development of Christianity in the bosom of the world's life was the hope of the men of Mercersburg.

They were mediationalists not merely in seeking to rec-

oncile the different Churches—Catholic and Protestant—but also in trying to harmonize the substance of dogmas with the results of science, religion with culture, by putting old truth into new forms. They recognized the right of reason but escaped rationalism by giving reason not a creative but a formative function in relation to revelation and religion. They made room for emotion in the Christian life, without yielding to fanaticism, by regarding feeling as “the child of truth and the parent of duty.” Their spirit in general was voiced in the slogan brought to America by Dr. Schaff: “In essentials, unity; in doubtful points, freedom; in all things, love.”

V. The reason for the critical attitude of the teachers of the Seminary toward the Churches and toward theological and scientific thought, and at the same time, for their spirit of conciliation and their hope of progress to a higher form of Christianity than had yet been attained, is to be found in the central position which they gave in their thought and life to Jesus Christ. They were Christological in their thinking and from their Christology all other articles of faith were deduced as by vital and logical necessity. A re-statement of the several Christian doctrines naturally followed.

Dr. Rupp says: “The shifting of the center of gravity of the theological system from the notion of the doctrine of the divine sovereignty or of justification by faith to the idea of the person of Christ and the change from the conception of abstract being and power to that of absolute reason and love in the apprehension of God must necessarily produce some alteration in the apprehension of every article or doctrine of Christian theology.”

Of course, in a way, all Christian Churches have acknowledged the supremacy of Christ. But the Mercersburg men did not emphasize primarily His teaching, nor His death as an expedient to satisfy God's wrath, nor His second coming as a means for the establishment of His Kingdom;

they laid all stress upon the constitution of His person in Whom Deity and humanity were organically united and through Whose life and death, resurrection and glorification, atonement was wrought between God and man; in principle all the antitheses that have perplexed men were resolved in the incarnation. What He was, gave efficacy to what He said and what He did. The union of God and man in Christ is perpetuated in His Church and its saving and sanctifying power is continually imparted to men through the means of grace and the mystical fellowship of believers. Thus in an organic and progressive way the benefits of the incarnation are communicated to the race and the Kingdom of God is progressively realized in the hearts and lives of men.

God must always be defined in terms of Jesus, and Jesus in terms of God. God is like Jesus and Jesus is like God. Through Him one must find the motive and the goal of the universe. In Him are hid the power and wisdom of God unto salvation. From Him proceeds the Spirit of life which enlightens, inspires, enables, comforts and sustains men in life's joys and sorrows from birth to death. By His Spirit the Bible must be understood and preached and taught. For the Law and the Prophets, the Psalmists and the Apostles bear witness to Him. Yea, all spheres of life, physical, intellectual, moral, religious, social, ethical, and industrial, must be brought into subjection to Him and when controlled by His Spirit they will serve His eternal purpose of righteousness and love.

VI. In many respects the Lancaster men differ from the Mercersburg men. In a changing world it could not be otherwise. New issues have arisen and new occasions teach new duties. The men of to-day differ from the men of an earlier period in definitions, in emphasis, in methods, in curricula. Yet there is a golden cord that binds together the faculties and the doctrines of the Seminary for a hundred years, namely, faith in Jesus Christ as the Savior and Lord of men.

The world from 1825 to 1875 was quite unlike the world from 1875 to 1925. The scientific method has taken the place of philosophical speculation; social interests are looming large above ecclesiastical institutions; the kingdom of God is recognized as greater than all the Churches and its realization as the purpose of every Church; the industrial order with its labor-saving machines and complexity of life is superseding the agricultural order with its hand-labor and its simplicity of life; sociology, psychology, and pedagogy are consuming much of the time that was once taken by Hebrew, Greek, and dogmatics. Even the terminology of the class-room at present would sound strange to students of an earlier day. One of the older alumni recently spent a day hearing lectures of several of the professors. He was amazed at the simplicity of their language and seemed pleased that he could understand what they said.

In the Lancaster period Dr. Gast was the first among American Old Testament scholars to teach the documentary theory of the Pentateuch. Dr. Rupp was a pioneer in defining the social implications of the Gospel and in advocating the Christianizing of the social order; and at present excellent courses are given on religious psychology and religious pedagogy to prepare men as leaders in Christian education. The distinction continues to be made between belief in every statement of a verbally inspired Bible and faith in the living, triumphant Christ Who is revealed in the Bible: between the permanent elements of Christianity and the transient institutional and literary forms in which these elements have been embodied from time to time; between the immutable facts of Christian revelation and their theological interpretation; between the Churches and the Kingdom of God which is to be progressively realized, not through evolution or through a cataclysm or through education and culture but by the power of God proceeding from Christ through the Spirit into men's hearts and lives and working not by sacramental magic or immediate infusion but through



living persons who are the real means of grace and agents under God for the regeneration of the world.

The work of salvation and Christianization is not dependent upon forces that are latent in the cosmic order; but there are cosmic forces, which, when liberated by the investigations and discoveries of the scientist, are to be made subservient to the saving of men. Biology, psychology, and pedagogy in themselves have no regenerating power, but a knowledge of the laws which control the souls of men becomes an invaluable aid to the Christian minister, teacher, evangelist and benevolent worker. Sociology alone will avail little, but a knowledge of the laws of society is of untold advantage for the introduction of Christian ideals into the social order.

The Seminary is fundamentalist in its doctrine, providing fundamentalism is defined in the words of Jesus: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life"; or in the language of Paul: "Other foundation no man can lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ"; or in the declaration of Peter: "In none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other Name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved"; or in the announcement of John: "Grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." The Seminary is *modernist*, providing modernism means that "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty"; that "new wine" must be put "into fresh wine-skins"; that "he that hath an ear is to hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches"; that the scientist, truly so called, is "thinking God's thoughts after Him"; that the Christian is to apply the spirit of Jesus in all the relations of life—individual and social, national and international,—in short, to live the natural life in a Christ-like way.

However firmly the Seminary has always stood for accurate and profound scholarship, let us not forget that its primary purpose, now as then, is not the making of theologians, but the training of Christian men for service in



the ministry of reconciliation. Scholarship is but one of the means to this end. We have no sympathy with erudition that is not in contact with men and women in the struggle for life; nor with sentimental pietism that luxuriates in stony places but withers quickly because there is no deepness of earth. We should like to find the vision of the prophet, the patience of the saint, the accuracy of the scientist, and the courage of the soldier in our modern man of God, whether he be a foreign missionary or a minister of a metropolitan Church.

What of the future? What God has in store for humanity in the coming years we do not profess to foresee. We have no infallible eschatology, no blue-print of the ages unrolled before us. But we live in hope. True, we may be perplexed at times but not unto despair; pursued but not forsaken; smitten down but not destroyed. We are optimistic, not because we are blind to the evil in the world, but because we see Jesus. Not all things yet are subjected to Him, but our hearts and hopes are set upon the living, dying, rising, reigning Christ, to Whom all power is given in heaven and upon earth. We cannot rest in the present; we cannot return to the past; we shall go forward, following the Living One, who was dead and is alive forevermore, and has the keys of death and of Hades. "One step enough for me." Enough that we have Jesus and that we may join in the triumphant hymn written by one of the professors of this Seminary:

"Jesus, I live to Thee,  
The loveliest and best;  
My life in Thee, Thy life in me,  
In Thy blest love I rest.

Jesus, I die to Thee,  
Whenever death shall come;  
To die in Thee is life to me  
In my eternal home."

LANCASTER, PA.

## X

### CHRISTIAN EDUCATION TO-DAY

PROVOST JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN, PH.D., LL.D.

*University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia*

Interest in a subject is indicated by the amount of space given to it in newspapers, periodicals and books at any given time, for these supply to the public what their editors or authors think will hold the attention of their readers. The age-old question what think ye of Christ is asked and answered thousands of times a year in the public prints, and not for the purpose of religious or theological controversy, rather for the purpose of finding some reasonable and acceptable answer to questions in thoughtful minds. What place should be given to religion in the formal courses of schools? What recognition do you give to it in your school or college or university courses? These are two questions which any college or university president finds as the basis of almost innumerable questionnaires received through the mail.

The following reply was made by me to a series of questions of this kind:

I am enclosing some notes on religious work at the University of Pennsylvania. This statement covers the ground so far as the external facts are concerned, but a great deal of the most important religious work that is done in our institutions of learning is in the form of conversations in students' rooms or on the campus, or wherever men may meet. There is a great deal of this going on at the University of Pennsylvania, and at other universities and colleges so that the external facts are only a part of what we are really accomplishing. I do not know how to put in words any complete statement concerning the religious life at the uni-

versity. Religious instruction is a term that must be interpreted in order to be significant. If by religious instruction we mean the formal teaching of the facts and theories about religion and about the books upon which religion is founded that is one thing, but very frequently it is not the teaching of religion itself. If by religious instruction we mean that which the student gets, and which influences his own life as a result of his association with right-minded, high-thinking men and women, that is another thing. It is perfectly easy to offer a whole curriculum of courses of Bible study, the history of religions, etc., without producing any very great religious result, which will show itself in the actual lives and conduct of the members of the class. Of course these things do influence men, but not always so much as the kindly word or deed or the Christian life unostentatiously led. There comes to my mind the old saying, concerning the difference between eloquence and poetry, that eloquence is addressed to an audience and intended to be heard, while poetry is the outpouring of the human heart not addressed to an audience, but frequently overheard. Unless a man has the root of the matter in him or has implanted in his mind or soul some really motivating impulse, the facts about religion make very little impression.

Through its established curriculum the University of Pennsylvania offers to its students a number of courses on religion and allied subjects. Included are courses on the Bible; the History of Religion; Primitive Religion; Semitics, Greek, Archeology; the Philosophy of Religion; the Psychology of Religion; the Psychology of Religious Experience, and others.

While these courses are calculated to satisfy the intellectual demands, it is felt by the university that the purely cultural studies relating to religion may well be supplemented.

This is accomplished through a thorough-going coöperation on the part of the administration and faculty with the

Christian Association. On the Pennsylvania campus the Christian Association is the agency through which six of the great denominations present a united front in the name of Protestant religion to the student body.

These six denominations are the Protestant Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Lutheran, and the Reformed Church in America. All support ministers to students who are also secretaries of the Association.

Through the Association there is presented each year the opportunity to study the Bible and related religious topics in volunteer classes. The courses offered vary from studies in the Gospels, the Prophets, "What is Christianity?" "Science and Religion" (seven hundred students in the University voted to study this), "The Christian Way of Life," "International Questions and Christianity," and similar topics, to the problems of the campus and questions of personal faith.

This year something over 2,200 students voluntarily attend these studies. More than one third the total enrollment in the Engineering Schools attend five classes taught by Prof. C. E. Clewell. Other members of the faculty teach the courses as do clergymen, lawyers, the Christian Association secretaries and others.

Under the supervision of the Association, courses are offered on Sundays in six churches near the campus. More than 500 students are enrolled in these classes and average 200 to 250 in attendance.

There is the closest union of the denominations in the presentation and conduct of the Religious Education program. The competitive spirit is entirely absent and each man firmly believes that the success of the one great program is his greatest individual success.

The counsel and coöperation of the university is constantly sought and is freely given; and there is the feeling on the part of the Association that the university backs its

work to the limit, a feeling constantly fed by the time and attention given it both by the administration and the faculty

In speaking of a decline in piety and the spirit of devotion among young people a writer in 1837 in a little annual for children called the *Evergreen* says what has a singularly familiar sound to us.

"Is it not now the case that many parents neglect their children for a multitude of meetings, enough almost to distract the mind."

The influences exerted by parents on children in early years are never wholly outgrown. How important then that these influences should be of the right kind and that the minds and souls of children should be impressed with the necessity of religion in any happy life.

Parents have brought their sons to me to enter upon courses of study in college and have asked me to protect their sons from temptations and look after their conduct. I have invariably replied, "If you have failed to establish your son's character upon sure foundation during the eighteen years, you have had him under your direct care, you cannot expect the university to undo the results of your failure. We will gladly do all that we can, but you must consider the kind of material with which we shall have to work." A youth trained to respect authority, to listen respectfully to his elders, to believe in the great principles of Christian conduct, is a very different person from the youth who has never felt or experienced the personal influence and example of God-fearing Christian parents in a home of culture and refinement.

Miracles may be worked and I have seen them in the lives of college students, and persons of greater maturity, but parental guidance in the right way is of incalculable value. We hear much about allowing youth to work out their own lives on the basis of their own experiences and I believe in this, but there are long years during which they need intelli-

gent guidance to protect them from dangers which they are too ignorant to foresee or guard against. The captain of the *Umbria* many years ago told a questioning passenger that it was more important to know where deep water and a clear channel was than to know the precise location of every rock. The basic principles of Christian character indicate a line and manner of conduct that will not bring you near the rocks—a channel that leads straight to happiness and contentment in life. I quote the following words from a recent book (J. Brierley, *Ourselves and the Universe*, London, 1902):

“But in the love and joy which He (Christ) made to spring up in human hearts, the sense of forgiveness, of sonship, of inward sanctifying, there was nothing legendary. There is nothing legendary either about the same experiences that fill the souls of men to-day, wherever He is preached and accepted. But what is the intellectual equivalent of such a feeling as this! Theology has through all the ages been trying to find it for us, and has not succeeded any too well. But whatever the formula we accept as to the Person of Christ, this at least the scientific as well as the Christian consciousness demands; that it shall not be lower than the effect. The Apostles and first witnesses felt that their souls had been in contact with God and they said so. The living church though it may vary its phraseology, repeats the affirmation,—“Here is faith’s central and impregnable defence.”

Christian consciousness is the life of the church. Of the transforming power of Christ, Phillips Brooks said in his *Address on Thought and Action*

“... the true way for you to find Christ is not to go groping in a thousand books. It is not for you to try evidence about a thousand things that people have believed of Him, but it is for you to undertake so great a life, so devoted a life, so pure a life, so serviceable a life, that you cannot do it except by Christ, and then see whether Christ helps you. See whether there comes to you the certainty that you are a child of God, and the manifestation of the

child of God becomes the most credible, the most certain thing to you in all history."

We must always be careful before reaching conclusions as to what are the teachings of Christ, and not confine ourselves to what a preacher or scholar expresses merely as an opinion concerning the meaning of the words of Christ. The basic principles of Christian faith and consequently Christian conduct are the words of Christ, and not interpretation of those words. Even in the early church there arose differences of opinion which are referred to in the New Testament such as the supposed controversy between works and faith, which brought forth the words "Faith if it have not works is dead in itself." (James 2, 17.)

Christianity is dynamic. It shows itself in conduct of life. The classic passage is found in the tenth chapter of Luke's Gospel in the parable of the good Samaritan in answer to the Lawyer's question "who is my neighbor?" In Matthew's Gospel the lawyer asked Christ:

"Which is the great commandment in the Law?

"And Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind."

"This is the first and great commandment and the second is like unto it, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'"

In Luke's Gospel the Lawyer asked the question,

"Master what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the Law? How readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself, and he said unto him, Thou hast answered right, this do and thou shalt live. But he willing (or desiring) to justify himself said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor?"

The term education is used of the process and of the results of imparting knowledge and training, mental and moral. The primary use of the word was never that of drawing out



the powers of the undeveloped mind, although the etymology of the word is commonly thought to warrant that meaning. There must be the imparting of knowledge not already possessed, and the training of powers of thought, so that the mind becomes, to use a very familiar phrase "a logic engine," capable of distinguishing between false and true, and of passing from one or more premises to a conclusion consistent with the premises upon which it is based. We educate in order to accomplish such purposes as the enlightenment of the understanding, the discipline of the temper, the cultivation of the taste, the formation of habits of thought or of action. Christian education includes all of these, with Christ and his teachings enfolding and controlling the life of the individual. In all the fields of human thought in which the mind of the Christian works we must be able to find a certain quality in the result of the work. There must be something spiritual which distinguishes the personality of the worker. Lawrence Oliphant phrased it the worker "must have lived the life." The greatest influence in the world is that exerted by a great personality. The greatest personality in the world is the personality of Christ. Education means more than mere development. There must be constant growth in knowledge as well as growth in grace. The best minds are not altogether original. They must take to themselves all the knowledge available. They are not bound by the traditions of the past simply because they are ancient. They must test and try by reason and experience what the past has to give them and then by a spiritual alchemy transmute lead into gold, into life of to-day.

What part are colleges and seminaries and universities to play in this training and developing of the minds and souls of men into unison with the life and teachings of Christ? May I try to answer this question.

Institutions may influence powerfully for good the lives of those who attend the courses—



1. By making paramount the imparting of knowledge and the search for truth.
2. By focussing, so far as possible, the attention of the student upon the great realities of life both intellectual and moral.
3. By making it perfectly clear that there is a world of difference between fact or truth, and mere personal opinion.
4. By pointing the way in which the student may for himself distinguish between fact and opinion.
5. By impressing on his mind the fact that life is the opportunity of the Soul and that happiness depends upon finding a work that he can do with his whole heart; a work that is "honest, useful and cheerful" to use a phrase of Ruskin's.
6. By showing him that the measure of a noble life is found in the increasing clearness of its vision of the ideal towards which it strives with ardour.
7. By showing him that there are two classes of men—those who follow a plan of what they would make of their lives—the other those who drift, or let events shape their lives for them.
8. By calling attention to the fact that every great and pure spirit was misunderstood by some if not by all of his contemporaries. This was true of Christ. It was true of others, such as Socrates, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Luther, Washington, Lincoln.
9. By calling the attention of youth to the fact that a great life must be guided by conviction which gives unity to life. If a man would act with his whole heart and mind, take the straight path of duty and meet courageously the sorrows and difficulties of the road, he must know in his heart that the end of his journey lies beyond those sorrows and difficulties.
10. By telling men and women that goodness, truth and beauty are realities with which we may live and that

the power of them is excited by communion with them. That from this we gain strength as we press on. It has been said that the supreme human achievement is to make resolutions and keep them.

These ten suggestions that I have made are based upon my own experience in life, upon the words of those who have taught me, either by spoken words or through printed pages. I believe them to be profoundly true and I believe that it is my duty as it is the duty of every teacher to impress them upon the minds of his pupils. Teaching is serious business when we consider what the results of it ought to be. We are to do something more than impart categorical information, however important to man, to enable him to understand his environment and the forces that are at work in nature. We must so far as possible be the means of bringing about a revelation of men to themselves. If it be in our power, and sometimes it is, we must show men to themselves, show them their possibilities as we see them, show them their weaknesses as we see them and above all show them the sources of strength and the power of the transfigured life.

We are liable to be self-deceived quite as often underestimating our powers as overestimating them. But we can never overestimate the greatness of the opportunity of life. We must constantly bring our lives to the test of what is perfect, truth, goodness, beauty. We must set our chronometers, we must compare ourselves with standards. So long as our hearts respond to spiritual influences we are alive and growing.

Infinite patience is needed by teacher and learner, if either is to progress towards the ideals of life of which I have been speaking. I have read somewhere the statement that "lack of patience ruins more great enterprises than lack of ideals, or lack of knowledge, or lack of energy."

"The worst results of impatience are not found in the failure of great and noble work. They are seen in the

characters of those who have become the victims of its scorn and fretfulness."

When as a result of our Christian faith we are able to stifle every harsh thought concerning our neighbor, and are able to help him by our example of a life controlled from within, we are living the life of which Christ set us the example. Hegel said "It is only as we are in ourselves that we can develop ourselves, yet it is we ourselves that develop ourselves." No human force is comparable to the will. The teaching of the facts of religious history, the teaching of a system of Theology, the discussion of so called religious problems are of no value, unless they aid men to secure that control of their own lives which characterizes the true follower of Christ. Professions of faith must be accompanied by that kind of life that is controlled by faith. Otherwise they are as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

## XI

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

*Mental Hygiene as Taught by Jesus.* By Alexander B. Mac Leod, M.A.  
Pages 138. The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, D.D., at the close of his preface to this book says: "I bespeak for it the earliest attention of Bible School teachers and of the laity and clergy of the churches." He does so advisedly. The book is unique in title and in content. It may be specially significant for teachers of religion, but it is equally so for all teachers and particularly for pastors. There is a renewed emphasis of the need of the pastor as a teacher and healer among his people. The viewpoint of pastoral work has changed. Aside of his work as preacher in the pulpit and teacher in an organized system of religious education, he is discovered as teacher and healer as he goes up and down among the people in fellowship and conversation. New helps are not wanting. From the point of view of psychology "The Subconscious Mind," formally published under the title of "Religion and Medicine," edited by Worcester, McComb, and Coriat is most valuable. From the point of view of sociology, "The Art of Helping People" by De Schweinitz is very practical. From the point of view of pedagogy, this volume on "Mental Hygiene as Taught by Jesus" is quite worth while.

The title "Mental Hygiene" in itself is a challenge. Hygiene has to do with the preservation of health. Mental hygiene regards not merely the health, but also the effect of a growing mind on health and efficient living. The author states in the introduction that "this little book is an attempt to outline and illustrate the principles of mental hygiene that governed the pedagogy of our Lord, a subject that, to my knowledge, has never been singled out for treatment hitherto." Later he writes: "Although Jesus did not present a

system of mental hygiene in any formal way, all his ministry, both as to substance and form, exemplified the fundamental principles of sound mental hygiene." The footnotes, references, and general content of the volume, however, make the reader feel that the influence of modern hygiene is really far more dominant in the mind of the writer than the teachings and pedagogy of Jesus.

The principles chosen for treatment are well selected. "Giving the mind free scope" is a primary principle in the pedagogy of Jesus. It unshackles the reason and conscience, and encourages independence of thinking. This is important from the standpoint of hygiene, for this process leads to spiritual self-reliance. Hence the title of the first chapter is "Mental self-reliance through freedom." As essential to this principle, the second one naturally follows, "The suggestiveness of Jesus." "Our Lord chose to be suggestive rather than didactic or exhaustive." A by-product of self-reliant freedom, in appropriating truth presented suggestively, is a growing openness and plasticity of mind. The chapter on "The Prolonging of Mental Plasticity" is one of the most helpful in the whole treatment. "To be able to reconsider a question, to reverse our whole attitude on it, to be able to learn and unlearn, ever to keep intellectually wide awake—these are the marks of mental health and vigor." "Adjusting Studies and Tasks of Life," the fourth principle, is further stated as follows: "Jesus made allowance for the mental and cultural differences that obtained among his hearers, and hence, sought to adapt his teachings to them accordingly." His teachings are always related to life experiences of a given individual or group. As a teacher he is an ideal master of the "project principle," so vigorously exploited now-a-days. Then, too, Jesus understood "The Hygiene of Encouragement." He knew how to put heart into people. All this must be to some purpose. "A most important factor in any good program of mental hygiene is a real worthy object in life." For the want of "Respon-

bility and Service" many people are mentally sick." A worthy task that will tax a man's powers to the limit is essential to sound mental health." The volume closes with a chapter on "Religion and Mental Hygiene."

The author's mode of treating these principles is to illustrate them in the method and teachings of Jesus, and then set them in the light of our own need of mental hygiene. Not a small part of the value of the book consists in the quotations and references given critically in the footnotes. One can hardly escape the feeling, despite the fine qualities of the book, that the stimulation for its writing is in modern mental hygiene rather than the personality and teaching of Jesus. For so small a volume it has an unusually large amount of fine practical material in fact, illustration, and suggestion.

EDWARD S. BROMER.

*The Key to Faith.* By M. O. Gershenson. Authorized translation from the Russian by Herman Frank. Pages 156. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925.

The author, Mikhail Osipovich Gershenson, is known in Russia and throughout Europe as a historian of literature as well as a critic and publicist. He was born in 1869 at Kishinev, Southwest Russia, of Jewish middle class stock. He was thoroughly educated, receiving his degree from the University of Moscow and having studied extensively in German universities. In the field of literary history and criticism there were in Russia a few great writers who dedicated themselves with consuming passion to the search for the Absolute Good. Gershenson was one of the greatest among them. He is greater as a philosopher, however, than literary critic and publicist. He has done much to interpret the leading Russian philosophers of the period 1800 to 1850 who were intellectual mystics. Among them two particularly impressed him, J. Chaadaiev and Ivan V. Kyrjevsky. For three and a half years prior to his death on February

19, 1925, he was president of the Moscow Academy of Art Sciences.

"The Key to Faith" is essentially a religious approach to the understanding of the Old Testament. It is a whole-hearted attempt by a modern to open up a new access to the "Book Eternal" of the Jewish religion. He freely acknowledges the historical and critical approach to the study of the Old Testament. But he believes that a proper understanding of it is possible only in the religious approach. He firmly believes that the religious impulses supply the cohesive force which unifies a society and a culture. For him the Old Testament offers the very essence of religion.

The successive headings of the chapters indicate the course of the development of the book as centered in the title—"The Key to Faith." "The Burning Bush" and "Jehovah Struggling with Man," which are the titles of the first and second chapters, constitute a remarkable study of the people struggling with nature and nature's God, the Fire-God Jehovah. The chapters, "The Covenant," the "Law of Retaliation," and "Faith and Self-will" lead up to the discussion of the "Essence of Religion." It has two aspects, both of which are immediately realized in monotheism: finally the world was conceived as an absolute unity, and, at the same time, as a man absolute and perfect, standing outside of time. The ancient, cosmic God is beneficent and cruel, and mainly requires homage from all men, respect and fear. His revelation is the ancient law of sacrificial worship. The human God is moral goodness, requiring obedience in love. The latter chapters, "The God Ideal of the Prophets," and "God and Humanity" maintain the same basic conception of God as cosmic and human, but develop the moral and humanitarian aspects of religion, culminating in a social order for the world, including all nations and demanding the centrality of the law of love.

The title, "The Key to Faith," is true to the point of view and treatment of the volume. It is essentially religious.

Its aim is to help men to find the secret of life in the living God. The writer is an intellectual mystic. His book is born out of the travail of the human spirit, struggling through the troubled years of later Russian history and coming out at last into the world-crisis of the great war. Out of Russia, suffering for the freedom of its great masses, and the world, we may expect great spiritual rebirths of which this volume is a prophecy. In the chapter, "Faith and Self-will" the key to faith is revealed.

"According to the Old Testament, the ability to tell the points of the compass of righteousness is an innate instinct, a sixth sense. Man is able to tell God's judgments, as the stork in heaven her appointed times, and the turtle, and the crane, and swallow observe the time of their coming. The all-sufficient guide for man's life is belief in the existence and omnipotence of God, trust in God, and not in earthly powers or in one's own skill, holding every success or misfortune not as due to chance or human calculations, but as an outcome of God's will, which it really is. This enables the believer to live at ease, and simply, like a tree or a bird, for believing is the state of man's soul in perfect correspondence with his nature. Faith guides him with certainty on the ways of life, he never knows the pangs of irresolution, nor does he hesitate at any stage of an important design; he instantly chooses by a method that operates like a sound instinct of scent, and is inflexibly resolute. Therefore Isaiah says: 'The way of the just is uprightness; thou, most upright, doth weigh (in advance and, of course, mindful of all contingencies) the path of the just; thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee.'"

EDWARD S. BROMER.

*Christian Monasticism, A Great Force in History.* By Ian C. Hannah, F.S.A., Professor of Church History, Oberlin College. Pages 270. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925.

The story of monasticism is presented in four periods. The first extends from the oriental beginnings till the days



when in the sixth century the great S. Benedict gave monasticism something of the organizing power of the west. This period is dominated by SS. Antony, Pachomius, and Basil the Great (Chs. I, II). The second covers the long period from the Benedictine monk to the later Cistercian, the important centuries of the development of culture of the Middle Ages. The early Benedictines, the Cluniacs, and the Cistercians dominate the period (Chs. III-IX). The third is the time of the Friars, S. Francis and S. Dominic. It marks a new era of active asceticism, truly in the world but not of it, setting the climax of mediæval culture (Ch. X). The chapters XI to XVI are devoted to the topical study of the monk as missionary, as statesman, as soldier, and monastic literature and art. The fourth period is characterized by the decline of mediæval orders and the rise of the new orders, especially the Jesuits, commissioned to repair the great losses of the church caused by the Reformation.

There are few general works on monasticism in English. There is much written about monks in monographs and general church histories. This volume by Professor Hannah fills a real need. It might be more effective as a treatise if it combined more of a philosophic grip on the subject with the handling of the great mass of historical details it collates. A splendid companion volume supplementing Hannah's, both in point of view and manner of treatment, is Herbert Workman's "Evolution of the Ascetic Ideal." The bibliography given at the close of each chapter should be noted as a valuable contribution. The easy style of the author makes the reading of the volume far more agreeable than is usual when such a mass of details and so many individuals are handled.

EDWARD S. BROMER.

*The History and Literature of the New Testament.* By Henry Thatcher Fowler, Ph.D. Macmillan. Pages 443. Price \$2.50.

This volume is one of the "Religious Science and Literature Series" edited by Prof. E. Hershey Sneath of Yale

University. Companion volumes already in print are: *The History of Religions* by Hopkins, *The History of the Religion of Israel* by Barton, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus* by Bosworth, and a *Book about the English Bible* by Penniman.

This series made a worthwhile contribution to the literature on New Testament subjects when it gave us Bosworth's *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*, a book which today holds an honored place among the leading books of its kind. Dr. Fowler's book covering the history and literature of the whole New Testament deserves equal recognition.

The aim of the book is to give as much of the history of Judaism and Christianity as seems necessary for a proper understanding and appreciation of the books of the New Testament. Each book is related to the life current of Christianity at the point where it gives expression to the thought or problem of the church of the particular place and time to or from which it was written. Placed in this vital contact with the life and growth of the church each book delivers a message of interest and worth which without this connection it would not have.

Needless to say, the author has to face many unsettled questions of interpretation. He shows clearly that he is aware of the many uncertainties with which he has to deal, but he makes equally clear that he is acquainted with the best interpretations of the leading scholars of today. He handles all these disputed questions in a constructive manner so that the reader is carried along step by step through Christianity's first century of history without stumbling over problems of criticism or becoming entangled in needless contradictions.

It is not easy to find a book on this subject as comprehensive, clear, concise and scholarly as this book by Prof. Fowler. It has the merit of being serviceable as a textbook and at the same time reads as if it were written for general

reading. It puts the best fruits of modern criticism before the reader in a constructive form and gives him a viewpoint of the New Testament and the history of early Christianity that will meet the tests of modern principle of research. The book should find a hearty welcome from ministers, teachers of religion, and lay readers interested in New Testament history.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ.

*Greek Culture and the Greek Testament.* By Doremus Almy Hayes. The Abingdon Press. Pages 224. Price \$1.50.

The subtitle of this book is "A Plea for the Study of the Greek Classics and the Greek New Testament." This subtitle expresses clearly the nature and purpose of the book. And it is a wonderful plea. The author's description of the land, the people, the language, and the literature of the Greeks is such as to make the reader glow with admiration for the Greek contribution to human ideals and achievement and make him resolve anew to lay claim to some of these treasures by reading Greek masterpieces in the original. College students debating whether or not it is worth while to study a so called dead language (the author however claims that classic Greek is far from a dead language) will find suggestive ideas here that are worth serious consideration.

Possibly the finest chapter in the book is the last one, entitled, "A Wonderful Book. The Greatest Greek Book: the New Testament." The modern minister who thinks that he can get along quite well with one of the numerous translations of the New Testament ought to read this book so that his eyes might be opened to a few of the treasures of the New Testament which no translation reveals to him. The author's exposition of but a few passages shows what a depth and richness of meaning lie behind the Greek words and phrases which no translation can express.

We heartily recommend this book to all ministers and

other students of the New Testament who are desirous of knowing the Word of God in its greatest beauty and clearest expression of truth.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ.

*Mountain Peaks in the Life of Our Lord.* By William Bancroft Hill, D.D., Litt.D. Revell. Pages 189. Price \$1.50.

The aim of this book is to give an interpretation of the Life of Jesus with the mountains and hills of Palestine as the background of the setting. That is, the author feels that most of the important events in the life of Jesus took place on some hillside or mountain top. The idea of building the life of Jesus around these mountain scenes is an attractive one and has merit. However, to build the whole life of Jesus on such a scheme demands some forced situations. Such a situation reveals itself in chapter six which is headed, "The Mount of Miracle." Here one would expect the depiction of a mountain scene where Jesus performed a number of His greatest miracles. But such a mount seems not to be at hand. However, the author does succeed in making many of the mountains of Palestine speak to us in a most interesting manner.

The author uses indiscriminately the four gospels in drawing his picture of Jesus and in setting forth in chronological order the events of His life. Many modern scholars no longer attempt this. They realize that the synoptic and the Johannine accounts are well nigh irreconcilable from the point of view of chronology as well as of teaching. One who is aware of these difficulties will, of course, find numerous points on which he must differ from Dr. Bancroft's interpretation. To cite just one instance. The author claims that Jesus after the miracle at Bethany where he raised Lazarus from the dead did not return to Perea but retired to an obscure village called Ephraim because He wanted to eat the Passover with His disciples before He suffered, knowing that if the Sanhedrin knew where He was they would take

Him into custody at once. But the Fourth Gospel from which this incident is taken clearly implies that Jesus did not eat the Passover with His disciples. What is called the last meal took place on the evening before the Passover. The book reveals a number of inconsistencies of this kind, inconsistencies inevitable whenever an attempt is made to harmonize the four Gospels.

But in spite of exceptions one may feel obliged to take from time to time, this book deserves prayerful reading on the part of devout students of the life of Jesus because of its vivid portrayal of the life and character of Jesus with the natural scenery of Palestine in the background of the setting.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ.

*Native Churches in Foreign Fields.* By Henry Hosie Rowland. The Methodist Book Concern. Pages 199. Price \$1.50.

The author of this book, himself a missionary for ten years, deals with a problem that presses itself upon Foreign Mission Boards and the missionaries upon the field with ever increasing persistence. To what extent and by what steps shall the native churches hitherto under the guidance and control of foreigners be given autonomy? That sooner or later the native church must become indigenous is no doubt the conviction and the hope of every Protestant missionary. But the when and the how bristle with problems not so easily solved.

The author makes a worthwhile contribution to the discussion of this vexing question. In the first chapter he gives a full discussion of what he means by an indigenous church, showing that it means more than the three S's, self support, self government, and self propagation. The indigenous church must develop a "culture that is native, an interpretation of Christianity that is adapted to the needs of the country, an architecture, a music, a ritual, and a form of discipline" that conform somewhat to the customs, aims, and aspirations of the natives.

This is followed by a chapter on the desirability, yea, the necessity of mission churches becoming thoroughly indigenous.

Next comes an interesting chapter on the History of Missions from the days of the Apostles to the present time, setting forth the success or failure of the various periods of missionary activity from the point of view of the establishment of indigenous churches in foreign lands.

The fourth chapter deals with the actual problems of the indigenous church.

The book gives one a panoramic view of the advance work that has been done in recent years in all the larger missionary fields of the world as well as a clear insight into the perplexing questions that are pressing for a solution. It is well written. The positions taken by the author are for the most part sound and practical. The book will be read with interest and profit by all who may have either a hand or a heart in the missionary work of today.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ.

*Ruth Talks It Over.* By Junius Vincent. Macmillan. Pages 130. Price \$1.50.

This little volume treats a very big problem of today with intelligence and sympathy. The problem concerns the freedom of the modern American girl with all its privileges and dangers.

The author, writing under an assumed name, writes up conversations and discussions held from time to time with a young woman who is a member of a social set in which proprieties of a generation ago are laughed at and the liberties of the flapper earnestly sponsored. The arguments and counsel of the author, a man brought up under the social regime of the older generation and a student of psychology and biology, are based on biological and psychological laws rather than on mere ethical principles or sentimental notions. With such a basis for the discussion the conclusions

arrived at are such as to carry weight with any intelligent and earnest inquirer into the subject.

It is refreshing to know that studies of this kind lead to the conclusion that in the main the flapper misses the course of real happiness and satisfaction of life while the woman who adheres more or less to the proprieties approved by former generations comes to the real inheritance, which her newborn freedom makes available for her.

This book in the hands of aspiring and disquieted daughters will provoke serious thought on their part and no doubt give them helpful advice.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ.

*The Crystal Pointers.* By F. W. Boreham. Pages 269. Price \$1.75. The Abingdon Press, New York.

Another Boreham book but never a suggestion of boredom. Readers of this well known Australian preacher's sermons will remember his unique homiletic methods. Gifted with rare imagination and a poet's insight, he takes the commonplace experiences of every-day life, the ship at sea, the chance acquaintance met on a train, the star, the cloud and invest them with spiritual significance. He indeed

Finds tongues in stones, books in the running brooks,  
Sermons in stones and good in everything.

A few of the sermon subjects suggest the nature of the contents: The Footlights, Pockets, Cranks, A Basket of Bombshells, The Wire Puller, Empty Pitchers. The modern preacher, inclined to discourse on social problems and international relations, may learn many helpful lessons as he studies the message and methods of Dr. Boreham. We should not neglect the individual in our zeal for social reconstruction; we must not overlook the homely contacts which comprise the round of life of the average person. They may be touched with a "light that never was on land or sea." Laymen also will find this book to be a great de-



light. We are glad to recommend it to the readers of the REVIEW.

LEE M. ERDMAN.

*Wisps of Wildfire.* By F. W. Boreham. The Abingdon Press, 1924. Price \$1.75.

Another book from the pen of that Australian whose books one cannot read without loving the man. Some one has said "To read one of Boreham's books is to find a new friend." Try one—there are at least sixteen—and you will be convinced of the truth of this statement.

Is it true that "there are sermons in stones"? Mr. Boreham—in this volume—finds sermons in a walking stick, in a blind alley, in a faggot, in sweethearts and fiddlesticks, in blushes, in black sheep, in a dark-room, in Christmas parcels, and even in a nervous breakdown. There is nothing so valuable to a preacher as the cultivation of a homiletical mind—after reading this volume a young preacher will see sermons where he never dreamed of seeing them before.

Not only does Mr. Boreham have the faculty of writing on almost any subject but his treatments are enriched by the fertility of his power of illustrations. In one of the twenty-one essays in this volume he refers to Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's "Memoirs of Arthur John Butler," Dickens' "Oliver Twist" and "Dombey and Son," Richard Jefferies' "Wood Magic," Holmes' "Poet at the Breakfast Table," Alfred Russel Wallace, Charles Darwin, Copley, and Roger Williams.

No one can read "Wisps of Wildfire" without receiving illumination on the obscure path of life.

CHARLES D. SPOTTS.

*What And Why Is Man?* By Richard La Rue Swain, Ph.D. Pages 339. Price \$1.75. The Macmillan Company, New York.

The writer of this book leaped into sudden and deserved fame as the author of *What and Where is God?* That



widely read volume revealed a mind that possessed depth and clarity, and a hand that could set down great thoughts in simple English and in lucid sentences. To an unusual degree, Dr. Swain combines sound learning and wide reading with the ability to instruct the man who lacks technical training in the mysteries of faith. There is a lack of dogmatic assertion and a note of candor and reverent humility in his utterances that makes them very persuasive. Even those who may differ and disagree with the writer in his premises and conclusions must admit the "sweet reasonableness" of his plea for God.

This new volume forms a worthy companion of the former writing. It has a noble theme—Man. And it presents this problematical creature in a most admirable manner. Dr. Swain tells us that the impetus to write on this "cognate" theme came from a suggestion made by the late Dr. Lyman Abbott. Were he still living the lamented master of high thinking and plain writing would doubtless welcome this volume as unreservedly as the one on God. Both in content and form it resembles the noblest of Dr. Abbott's many contributions to contemporary religious thought.

The contents of the book are as follows: Who Made God? How Did God Make the Human Body? Is the Method of Human Propagation Ideal? How is the Soul Made? Why Did God Make Man at All? Why Were We not Born in Heaven? Does God cause Earthquakes and Cyclones? Where did Sin come from? Did Man fall "Upward"? Why did Jesus Die? Why do We Pray? For what do We Live?

The very simplicity of these captions beguiles the reader. And yet they contain all the major elements of a new anthropology. It is an anthropology that lifts man out of the dust into the presence of God, his ground and goal. But it also traces his painful ascent and his present connection with the things that are earthy. Its conception of man

matches the idea of God as found in the former volume.

The two belong together as cause and effect, as Divine Father and Child having a noble heritage and a great destiny.

Most heartily do we recommend this uplifting volume to the readers of this REVIEW, and to all men who are seeking to find themselves in this perplexing world.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

*The East Window And Other Sermons.* By Halford E. Luccock. Pages 219. Price \$1.50. The Abington Press, 150 Fifth Ave., New York.

A splendid book for busy preachers, seeking sermonic suggestion and inspiration. The author is well known as a gifted sermonizer. His lines sparkle with wit and wisdom. His pages are adorned with apt quotations from recent literature. His themes are striking, but not sensational, and his sermons have the vital note of life.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

*My Religion.* By Emil G. Hirsch. Compilation and Biographical Introduction by Gerson B. Levi. Pages 382. Price \$5.00. The Macmillan Company, New York.

This massive memorial volume is dedicated to the memory of one of the great leaders of modern Judaism. Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch was known far beyond the bounds of the synagogue. His thorough learning and his eloquence made him a national figure. His death, in 1923, was widely mourned. It deprived the Sinai Congregation of Chicago of their gifted and loved leader; and American Judaism, of one of its chief guides and interpreters.

The volume under review was published by the congregation served by Dr. Hirsch, in loving memory of their teacher. It consists of addresses and sermons given by Dr. Hirsch on various occasions in the course of his loving ministry. Gentile as well as Jewish readers will peruse the

book with pleasure and profit. With pleasure, because it intones high ethical notes with ringing eloquence and aims at an Americanism in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but a nation conscious of its great power and devoted to its noble destiny. With profit, because it speaks with the authority of great learning of Judaism, past and present.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

*Week-Day Sermons In King's Chapel.* Sermons preached to Week-Day Congregations in King's Chapel, Boston. Edited by Harold E. B. Speight. Pages 184. Price \$1.75. The Macmillan Company, New York.

A collection of eighteen sermons preached by visiting ministers from different religious commissions and from various parts of this country and abroad. King's Chapel is a down-town church, on one of Boston's busiest corners. And these sermons were preached by able men, at noon and on week-days, to congregations that came daily and gladly, for several months in two successive years, in order to hear simple gospel messages adequate to meet universal needs.

Apart from their intrinsic merit, which is high, these sermons are an evidence that even a down-town church can interest men and women in religion, if it goes about its difficult ministry in the right way. And the right way is admirably pointed out by these discourses. It is equally far removed from sensational charlatanry and from archaic parrotry. It consists of sober thinking on high themes. It lifts the daily life of men into the light of great hopes, noble ambitions, and eternal assurances. The formula is simple enough, but the application of it invests the Christian ministry in our day with the charm and lure of a high calling.

THEO. F. HERMAN.